arXiv:0912.3755v1 [math.DG] 18 Dec 2009

The decomposition of global conformal invariants II: The Fefferman-Graham ambient metric and the nature of the decomposition.

Spyros Alexakis*

Abstract

This is the second in a series of papers where we prove a conjecture of Deser and Schwimmer regarding the algebraic structure of "global conformal invariants"; these are defined to be conformally invariant integrals of geometric scalars. The conjecture asserts that the integrand of any such integral can be expressed as a linear combination of a local conformal invariant, a divergence and of the Chern-Gauss-Bonnet integrand.

The present paper addresses the hardest challenge in this series: It shows how to *separate* the local conformal invariant from the divergence term in the integrand; we make full use of the Fefferman-Graham ambient metric to construct the necessary local conformal invariants, as well as all the author's prior work [1, 2, 3] to construct the necessary divergences. This result combined with [3] completes the proof of the conjecture, subject to establishing a purely algebraic result which is proven in [6, 7, 8].

Contents

1 Introduction. 2

1.1 Outline of the argument. 6

1.2 Divide Proposition 1.1 into four smaller claims. 9

2 The locally conformally invariant "piece" in $P(g)$: A proof of Lemmas 1.1, 1.2, 1.3. 11

2.1 The Fefferman-Graham construction of local conformal invariants and an algorithm for computations. 11

2.2 Proof of Lemma 1.1: 16

---

*University of Toronto, alexakis@math.toronto.edu.

This work has absorbed the best part of the author's energy over many years. This research was partially conducted during the period the author served as a Clay Research Fellow, an MSRI postdoctoral fellow, a Clay Liftoff fellow and a Procter Fellow.

The author is immensely indebted to Charles Fefferman for devoting twelve long months to the meticulous proof-reading of the present paper. He also wishes to express his gratitude to the Mathematics Department of Princeton University for its support during his work on this project.

2.3 Proof of Lemma 1.2: Proof of half the Lemma. 17
2.4 Proof of Lemmas 1.3 and 2.3 (the second half of Lemma 1.2). . . 24

3 Proof of Lemma 1.4: The divergence "piece" in $P(g)$. 35
3.1 Preliminary work: How can one recover $P(g)$ from $I^1_g(\phi)$? 36
3.2 The main algebraic Propositions. 40
3.3 Proof of Lemma 1.4. 47

1 Introduction.

This is the second in a series of papers [3, 5, 6, 7, 8] where we prove a conjecture of Deser-Schwmimmer [15] regarding the algebraic structure of global conformal invariants. We recall that a global conformal invariant is an integral of a natural scalar-valued function of Riemannian metrics, $\int_{M^n} P(g)dV_g$, with the property that this integral remains invariant under conformal re-scalings of the underlying metric.[1] More precisely, $P(g)$ is assumed to be a linear combination, $P(g) = \sum_{l\in L} a_l C^l(g)$, where each $C^l(g)$ is a complete contraction in the form:

$$contr^l(\nabla^{(m_1)}R\otimes\dots\otimes\nabla^{(m_s)}R); \tag{1.1}$$

here each factor $\nabla^{(m)}R$ stands for the m^{th} iterated covariant derivative of the curvature tensor R. ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection of the metric g and R is the curvature associated to this connection. The contractions are taken with respect to the quadratic form g^{ij}. In this series of papers we prove:

Theorem 1.1 *Assume that $P(g) = \sum_{l\in L} a_l C^l(g)$, where each $C^l(g)$ is a complete contraction in the form (1.1), with weight $-n$. Assume that for every closed Riemannian manifold (M^n, g) and every $\phi \in C^\infty(M^n)$:*

$$\int_{M^n} P(e^{2\phi}g)dV_{e^{2\phi}g} = \int_{M^n} P(g)dV_g.$$

Then $P(g)$ can then be expressed in the form:

$$P(g) = W(g) + div_iT^i(g) + \text{Pfaff}(R_{ijkl}).$$

Here $W(g)$ stands for a local conformal invariant of weight $-n$ (meaning that $W(e^{2\phi}g) = e^{-n\phi}W(g)$ for every $\phi \in C^\infty(M^n)$), $div_iT^i(g)$ is the divergence of a Riemannian vector field of weight $-n+1$, and Pfaff(R_{ijkl}) *is the Pfaffian of the curvature tensor.*

We recall from the introduction in [3] that this entire wok can be naturally subdivided into two parts: Part I, consisting of [3], the present paper and [5] prove Theorem 1.1 subject to deriving certain purely algebraic propositions, namely the "main algebraic Proposition" 5.2 in [3] and Propositions 3.1, 3.2 in the present paper. Part II, consisting of papers [6, 7, 8] is devoted to proving these algebraic Propositions.

---

[1] See the introduction of [3] for a detailed discussion of the Deser-Schwimmer conjecture, and for background on scalar Riemannian invariants.

In [3] we explained that our proof of Theorem 1.1 relied on a main inductive step which asserts that given a $P(g)$ as in Theorem 1.1, if the minimum number of factors among all complete contractions $C^l(g)$ in $P(g)$ is $\sigma < \frac{n}{2}$, then we can *subtract* a divergence and a local conformal invariant from $P(g)$ so as to *cancel out* the terms with σ factors in $P(g)$, modulo introducing new terms $\sigma + 1$ factors. In conjunction with the results of [1, 2], this main inductive step implies Theorem 1.1.

This main inductive step consists of two sub-steps, the Propositions 3.1, 3.2 in section 3 in [3]. Proposition 3.1 was proven in [3] (subject to deriving the "main algebraic Proposition" 5.2 there). The present paper is devoted to proving the second (harder) Proposition 3.2.

We state this second Proposition again, after recalling two main pieces of notation:

Conventions: For any complete or partial contraction in α factors $T^1, \dots, T^\alpha$,[2] $contr(T^1 \otimes \dots \otimes T^\alpha)$, an *internal contraction* is a pair of indices in a given factor T^β which contract against each other. For each complete contraction in the form (1.2), δ_W stands for the total number of internal contractions. Also, for each complete or partial contraction, its "length" will be its number of factors.

Proposition 3.2 in [3] states:

Proposition 1.1 *Consider any $P(g)$, $P(g) = \sum_{l \in L} a_l C^l(g)$ where each $C^l(g)$ has length $\geq \sigma$, and each $C^l(g)$ of length σ is in the form:*[3]

$$contr(\nabla^{(m_1)} W \otimes \dots \otimes \nabla^{(m_\sigma)} W). \tag{1.2}$$

Assume that $\int_{M^n} P(g) dV_g$ is a global conformal invariant. Denote by $L_\sigma \subset L$ the index set of terms with length σ.

We claim that there is a local conformal invariant $W(g)$ of weight $-n$ and also a vector field $T^i(g)$ as in the statement of Theorem 1.1, so that:

$$\sum_{l \in L_\sigma} a_l C^l(g) - W(g) - div_i T^i(g) = 0, \tag{1.3}$$

modulo complete contractions in the form (1.1) of length $\geq \sigma + 1$.

Note: As explained in [3], we prove this proposition for $\sigma \geq 3$. The special cases $\sigma = 1, \sigma = 2$ are treated in section 2 in [5].

Digression: A general discussion on local conformal invariants. Since the present paper deals extensively with the issue of constructing *local conformal invariants* (as required in (1.3)), we digress slightly to discuss some background material regarding the history and known constructions of such invariants:

---

[2] See the first section in [1] for a very rigorous definition of complete and partial contractions.

[3] W below stands for the Weyl tensor (W_{ijkl} if we write out the indices), the trace-free part of the curvature tensor. $\nabla^{(m)} W$ is the m^{th} covariant derivative of the Weyl tensor.

The theory of *local* invariants of Riemannian structures (and indeed, of more general geometries, e.g. conformal, projective, or CR) has a long history. As stated above, the original foundations of this field were laid in the work of Hermann Weyl and Élie Cartan, see [23, 14]. The task of writing out local invariants of a given geometry is intimately connected with understanding polynomials in a space of tensors with given symmetries, which remain invariant under the action of a Lie group. In particular, the problem of writing down all local Riemannian invariants reduces to understanding the invariants of the orthogonal group.

In more recent times, a major program was laid out by C. Fefferman in [16] aimed at finding all local invariants in CR geometry. This was motivated by the problem of understanding the local invariants which appear in the asymptotic expansions of the Bergman and Szegö kernels of CR manifolds, in a similar way to which Riemannian invariants appear in the asymptotic expansion of the heat kernel; the study of the local invariants in the singularities of these kernels led to important breakthroughs in [11] and more recently by Hirachi in [20]. This program was later extended to conformal geometry in [17]. Both these geometries belong to a broader class of structures, the *parabolic geometries*; these admit a principal bundle with structure group a parabolic subgroup P of a semi-simple Lie group G, and a Cartan connection on that principle bundle (see the introduction in [12]). An important question in the study of these structures is the problem of constructing all their local invariants, which can be thought of as the *natural, intrinsic* scalars of these structures.

In the context of conformal geometry, the first (modern) landmark in understanding *local conformal invariants* was the work of Fefferman and Graham in 1985 [17], where they introduced the *ambient metric*. This allows one to construct local conformal invariants of any order in odd dimensions, and up to order $\frac{n}{2}$ in even dimensions. The question is then whether *all* invariants arise via this construction.

The subsequent work of Bailey-Eastwood-Graham [11] proved that indeed in odd dimensions all conformal invariants arise via the Fefferman-Graham construction; in even dimensions, they proved that the same holds true when the weight in absolute value is bounded above by the dimension. The ambient metric construction in even dimensions was recently extended by Graham-Hirachi, [19]; this enables them to then indentify in a satisfactory way all local conformal invariants even when the weight (in absolute value) exceeds the dimension.

An alternative construction of local conformal invariants can be obtained via the *tractor calculus* introduced by Bailey-Eastwood-Gover in [10]. This construction bears a strong resemblance to the Cartan conformal connection, and to the work of T.Y. Thomas, [22]. The tractor calculus has proven to be very universal; tractor buncles have been constructed [12] for an entire class of parabolic geometries. The relation betweeen the conformal tractor calculus and the Fefferman-Graham ambient metric construction has been elucidated in [13].

The present series of papers [3]–[8], while pertaining to the question above (given that it ultimately deals with the algebraic form of local Riemannian and conformal invariants), nonetheless addresses a different *type* of problem: We here consider Riemannian invariants $P(g)$ for which the *integral* $\int_{M^n} P(g)dV_g$ remains invariant under conformal changes of the underlying metric; we then seek to understand the possible algebraic form of the *integrand* $P(g)$, ultimately proving that it can be de-composed in the way that Deser and Schwimmer asserted. It is thus not surprising that the prior work on the construction and understanding of local *conformal* invariants plays a central role in this endeavor, in the present paper and in [5].

On the other hand, our resolution of the Deser-Scwimmer conjecture will also rely heavily on a deeper understanding of the algebraic properties of the *classical* local Riemannian invariants. The fundamental theorem of invariant theory (see Theorem B.4 in [11] and also Theorem 2 in [1]) is used extensively throughout this series of papers. However, the most important algebraic tool on which our method relies are certain "main algebraic Propositions" presented in [3] and in the present paper. These are purely algebraic propositions that deal with *local Riemannian invariants*. While the author was led to these Propositions out of the strategy that he felt was necessary to solve the Deser-Schwimmer conjecture, they can be thought of as results with an independent interest. The *proof* of these Propositions, presented in [6, 7, 8] is in fact not particularily intuitive. It is the author's sincere hope that deeper insight will be obtained in the future as to *why* these algebraic Propositions hold.

Local conformal invariants in our proof: The first half of this paper deals largely with the problem of identifying a local conformal invariant *in* $P(g)$. As explained in more detail in the "outline" below, we construct three *different kinds* of local conformal invariants, each of which will "cancel out" a particular *kind* of terms in $P(g)$. The next challenge is to then cancel out the *remaining piece* in $P(g)|_\sigma := \sum_{l\in L_\sigma} a_l C^l(g)$ by subtracting *only* a divergence of a vector field. As explained above, one has a powerful tool in the challenge of constructing local conformal invariants; this is the Fefferman-Graham ambient metric, [17, 18]. A note is in order here: The roughest simplification of $P(g)|_\sigma$ is to "cancel out" terms $C^l(g)$ in $P(g)$ which do not involve *internal contractions*.[4] For many reasons, the use of local conformal invariants to cancel out these particular terms in $P(g)$ is hardly surprising, in view (for example) of the proof of Proposition 3.2 in [11]. However, we believe that the use of local conformal invariants for the next two "simplifications" of $P(g)$ (in Lemmas 1.2, 1.3), *is* somewhat surprising: We prove that we can start with complete contractions in the form (1.2) *which do contain internal contractions*, and *cancel out certain particular terms in this form* in $P(g)$ by subtracting local conformal invariants and explicitly constructed divergences; we do this modulo introducing *new terms* which are "better" (from our point of view) than the terms we cancelled out. The construction of local conformal invariants for Lemmas 1.2, 1.3 depends essentially on explicitly constructed *divergences in the ambient metric*,[5] and the subsequent of cancellations that occur in these constructions.

---

[4] I.e. we cancel out the terms in the form (1.2) which contain no factor $\nabla^{(m)}W$ with two indices contracting against each other; we do this modulo introducing *new terms* in the form (1.2) which *do* contain such internal contractions. This is the content of Lemma 1.1.

1.1 Outline of the argument.

The proof of Proposition 1.1 addresses two main challenges: Firstly, how to separate the local conformal invariant "piece" $W(g)$ in $\sum_{l\in L_\sigma} a_l C^l(g)$ from the divergence "piece" $div_i T^i(g)$. Secondly, how to use the *local equation* (i.e. the "super divergegce formula") that we have derived in [1] regarding the *conformal variation* of $P(g)$ to construct the divergence $div_i T^i(g)$ needed in 1.3.

Our argument proceeds as follows: At a first step we explicitly construct a local conformal invariant $W(g)$ and a divergence $div_i T^i(g)$ such that:

$$\sum_{l\in L_\sigma} a_l C^l(g) = W(g) + div_i T^i(g) + \sum_{l\in L_{new}} C^l(g),$$

where the complete contractions $C^l(g), l \in L_{new}$ are in the form (1.2), but have certain *additionnal* algebraic properties. (See Lemmas 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 below).

Thus, the first step reduces matters to proving Proposition 1.1 with $\sum_{l\in L_\sigma} a_l C^l(g)$ replaced by $\sum_{l\in L_{new}} a_l C^l(g)$. In step 2, we then revert to studying the *new* $P(g)$ by focusing on the conformal variation $I^1_g(\phi)$ and the super divergence formula for $I^1_g(\phi)$.[6] We prove that $\sum_{l\in L_{new}} a_l C^l(g) = div_i T^i(g)$, for some vector field $T^i(g)$. (This is proven in Lemma 1.4 below).

A few rermarks: It is not at all clear that the local conformal invariant we construct to prove (1.3) is the *unique* local conformal invariant for which (1.3) is true. It is also not clear that one cannot subtract further conformal invariants from $\sum_{l\in L_{new}} a_l C^l(g)$ in order to simplify it even further. At any rate, (as discussed in section 2) the local conformal invariants $W(g)$ that one subtracts from $P(g)$ in order to simplify it are all explicitly constructed using the Fefferman-Graham ambient metric, [17, 18]. Our construction is elaborate and relies on the study of linear combinations of complete contractions in the ambient metric with specific algebraic properties. It is also worth noting that the algebraic properties of the terms in $\sum_{l\in L_{new}} a_l C^l(g)$ are precisely what is needed in order to prove (by the methods in section 3) that $\sum_{l\in L_{new}} a_l C^l(g) = div_i T^i(g)$.

We now discuss in more detail the two main steps in the proof of Proposition 1.1. *First Step:* We show (in Lemmas 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 below) that there exists a local conformal invariant $W(g)$ and a divergence $div_i T^i(g)$ so that:

$$P(g) = W(g) + div_i T^i(g) + \sum_{f\in F} a_f C^f(g) + \sum_{j\in Junk-Terms} a_j C^j(g), \quad (1.4)$$

---

[5] These are *local conformal invariants*, by construction; they are (at least apriori) *not* divergences for the base metric g.

[6] Recall that $I^1_g(\phi) := \frac{d}{dt}|_{t=0}[e^{nt\phi} P(e^{2t\phi} g)]$, $\int_{M^n} I^1_g(\phi) dV_g$; we have then derived a useful local formula in [3], which we called the "super divergence formula".

where the terms indexed in $Junk-Terms$ have at least $\sigma+1$ factors, while the terms indexed in F are in the form (1.2) *and have internal contractions in at least two different factors.*

The second step is to show that there exists another divergence $div_iT'^i(g)$ so that (in the notation of (1.4)):

$$\sum_{f\in F} a_f C^f(g) = div_iT'^i(g) + \sum_{j\in Junk-Terms} a_j C^j(g). \tag{1.5}$$

The above two sub-steps combined prove Proposition 1.1.

An outline of the proof of (1.4): As explained, the proof of this step relies heavily on the *ambient metric* of Fefferman and Graham [17, 18]. This is a strong tool that allows one to explicitly construct all *local conformal invariants* of weight $-n$ in dimension n. By making detailed use of the precise form of the ambient metric (and in one instance of the super divergence formula), we are able to *explicitly* construct the local conformal invariant $W(g)$ and the divergence $div_iT^i(g)$ needed for (1.4). The "main algebraic Propositions" 3.1 and 3.2 of the present paper are *not* used in deriving (1.4).

An outline of the proof of (1.5): (1.5) is proven by a new induction: *At a rough level,* the new induction can be described as follows: We denote by j the *minimum number of internal contractions* among the complete contractions indexed in F. Denote the corresponding index set by $F_j\subset F$. We then prove that we can write:

$$\sum_{f\in F_j} a_f C^f(g) = div_iT'^i(g) + \sum_{f\in F'_{j+1}} a_f C^f(g) + \sum_{t\in Junk-Terms} a_t C^t(g). \tag{1.6}$$

Here the terms indexed in F'_{j+1} are complete contractions in the form (1.5) with $j+1$ internal contractions in total, of which at least two belong to different factors.

Observe that (1.5) clearly follows by iterative application of (1.6).[7]

Now, there are a number of difficulties in proving (1.6):

How can one "recognize" the linear combination $\sum_{f\in F_j} a_f C^f(g)$ (which appears in $P(g)$) in $I^1_g(\phi)$? We observe that in this setting, $I^1_g(\phi)$ can be expressed as:

$$I^1_g(\phi) = \sum_{x\in X} a_x contr^x(\nabla^{(m_1)}R\otimes\dots\otimes\nabla^{(m_\sigma)}R\otimes\nabla^{(p)}\phi) + \sum_{j\in Junk-Terms} a_j C^j(g), \tag{1.7}$$

---

[7] This is because there can be at most $\frac{n}{2}$ internal contractions in any non-zero complete contraction in the form (1.2) with weight $-n$.

where the complete contractions indexed in X have $\sigma+1$ factors in total, while $\sum_{j\in Junk-Terms} a_j C^j(g)$ stands for a generic linear combination of complete contractions with at least $\sigma+2$ factors. We denote by $(I^1_g(\phi))_{\nabla\phi}$ the "piece" in $\sum_{x\in X}\dots$ which consists of terms with a factor $\nabla\phi$.

Observe that $(I^1_g(\phi))_{\nabla\phi}$ can *only* arise from the terms in $P(g)$ with σ factors in total.[8]

In fact (as we will show in subsection 3.1), we can easily reconstruct $\sum_{f\in F_j} a_f C^f(g)$ in $P(g)$ if we are given the "piece" $(I^1_g(\phi))_{\nabla\phi}$ in $I^1_g(\phi)$. Thus, our aim is to use the super divergence formula for $I^1_g(\phi)$ to express $(I^1_g(\phi))_{\nabla\phi}$ as "essentially a divergence".

The most important difficulty in deriving (1.6) appears when we apply the super divergence formula to $I^1_g(\phi)$. To illustrate why this case is harder than the case $s>0$ which was treated in [3], we will note that $I^1_g(\phi)$ can be expressed as follows:

$$I^1_g(\phi)=\big(I^1_g(\phi)\big)_{\nabla\phi}+\sum_{q\in Q} a_q C^q(g)\cdot\Delta\phi+\sum_{z\in Z} a_z C^z_g(\phi)+\sum_{j\in Junk-Terms} a_j C^j_g(\phi), \tag{1.8}$$

where the terms $C^q(g)\cdot\Delta\phi$ are in the form:

$$contr(\nabla^{(m_1)}R\otimes\dots\otimes\nabla^{(m_\sigma)}R\otimes\Delta\phi), \tag{1.9}$$

(notice they have $\sigma+1$ factors in total), while the terms $C^z_g(\phi)$ are in the form:

$$contr(\nabla^{(m_1)}R\otimes\dots\otimes\nabla^{(m_\sigma)}R\otimes\nabla^{(p)}\phi), \tag{1.10}$$

where $p\ge 2$ and moreover if $p=2$ then the two indices ${}_{a},{}_{b}$ in $\nabla^{(2)}_{ab}\phi$ are *not* contracting against each other in (1.10). Furthermore, it follows that[9] the terms $C^q(g)\cdot\Delta\phi$ in (1.8) arise *both* from the terms with σ factors in $P(g)$ *and* from terms with $\sigma+1$ factors in $P(g)$.

Now, to obtain a *local formula* for the expression $\big(I^1_g(\phi)\big)_{\nabla\phi}$ we consider the super divergence formula applied to $I^1_g(\phi)$ and pick out the terms which have $\sigma+1$ factors in total, and furthermore have a factor $\nabla\phi$ (differentiated only once). It follows that the linear combination of *those* terms in $supdiv[I^1_g(\phi)]$ must vanish separately (modulo junk terms with more that $\sigma+1$ factors): We thus obtain a new *local* equation, which we denote by:

$$supdiv_+[I^1_g(\phi)]=\sum_{j\in Junk-Terms} a_j C^j(g). \tag{1.11}$$

Now, if one follows the algorithm for the super divergence formula,[10] one observes that the terms in the RHS of (1.8) which can contribute terms to

---

[8] This is by virtue of the transformation law for the Levi-Civita connection, see (3.2)–these facts are explained in detail in subsection 3.1.

[9] See subsection 3.1.

[10] (See subsection 6.3 in [1], and also the "main consequence of the super divergence formula" in [3]).

supdiv$_+[I^1_g(\phi)]$ are the terms in $\big(I^1_g(\phi)\big)_{\nabla\phi}$ in (1.8), but *also* the terms $\sum_{q\in Q} a_q C^q(g)\cdot\Delta\phi$ in (1.8).[11] Thus, whereas in $I^1_g(\phi)$ (*before* we consider the super divergence formula), the terms with a factor $\nabla\phi$ (and with $\sigma+1$ factors in total) can *only* arise from the "worst piece" of $P(g)$,[12] *after* we apply the super divergence formula we *also* obtain terms in *supdiv*$_+[I^1_g(\phi)]$ which arise from $\sum_{q\in Q} a_q C^q(g)\cdot\Delta\phi$; this is very worrisome since *we have no information on the algebraic form of* $\sum_{q\in Q} a_q C^q(g)\cdot\Delta\phi$.[13] At this point the fact that the terms with length σ in $P(g)$ are all in the form (1.2) and have two internal contractions belonging to different factors is crucial. We prove (1.5) (explaining how to overcome these difficulties) in section 3.

1.2 Divide Proposition 1.1 into four smaller claims.

The main assumption for all four of the Lemmas below is that $\int_{M^n} P(g)dV_g$ is a global conformal invariant and $P(g)=\sum_{l\in L} a_l C^l(g)$, where each $C^l(g)$ has at least σ factors. The contractions $C^l(g)$ that do have σ factors will be indexed in $L_\sigma \subset L$ and will all be in the form (1.2).

First three Lemmas: The local conformal invariant "piece" in $P(g)$: We firstly focus on the complete contractions $C^l(g), l\in L_\sigma$ with *no internal contractions*. We index those complete contractions in the set L^0_σ and consider the sublinear combination $P(g)|_{L^0_\sigma}(:=\sum_{l\in L^0_\sigma} a_l C^l(g))$. Our first claim is the following:

Lemma 1.1 *Assume that* $P(g)=\sum_{l\in L} a_l C^l(g)$ *is as in the assumption of Proposition 1.1. We claim that there is a conformally invariant scalar* $W(g)$ *of weight* $-n$ *such that:*

$$P(g)-W(g)=\Sigma_{t\in T} a_t C^t(g)+\sum_{u\in U} a_u C^u(g),$$

where all the complete contractions $C^t(g)$ *are in the form (1.2) with length* σ *and* $\delta_W\geq 1$. *Each* $C^u(g)$ *has length* $\geq\sigma+1$.

Assuming we can prove the above Lemma, we are reduced to proving Proposition 1.1 under the extra assumption that all complete contractions $C^l(g)$, $l\in L_\sigma$ have at least one internal contraction (in other words we may now assume that $L^0_\sigma=\emptyset$).

We then denote by $L^1_\sigma\subset L_\sigma$ the index set of the complete contractions $C^l(g), l\in L^1_\sigma$ with one internal contraction. We claim:

---

[11] In particular, the terms $C^q(g)\cdot\Delta\phi$ can give rise to an iterated divergence of a tensor field with a factor $\nabla_i\phi$ (with the index $_i$ being free).

[12] (See the statement of Proposition 1.1). This is good for our purposes, since we are trying to "recover" the "piece" $\sum_{l\in L_\sigma} a_l C^l(g)$ in $P(g)$ by examining $I^1_g(\phi)$.

[13] This is bad for our purposes, because it is then not obvious how the contribution of the terms $\sum_{q\in Q} a_q C^q(g)\cdot\Delta\phi$ to the formula *supdiv*$_+[I^1_g(\phi)]=(Junk-Terms)$ can be *distinguished* from the contribution of the terms $\big(I^1_g(\phi)\big)_{\nabla\phi}$.

Lemma 1.2 *Assume that* $P(g) = \sum_{l\in L} a_l C^l(g)$ *satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 1.1; additionaly, assume that each* $C^l(g), l \in L_\sigma$ *satisfies* $\delta_W \geq 1$. *We claim that there is a conformally invariant scalar* $W(g)$ *and a vector field* $T^i(g) = \sum_{r\in R} a_r C^{r,i}(g)$ *of weight* $-n+1$, *where each* $C^{r,i}(g)$ *is in the form (1.3) such that:*

$$\sum_{l\in L^1_\sigma} a_l C^l(g) - W(g) - div_i T^i(g) = \sum_{f\in F} a_f C^f(g), \tag{1.12}$$

where each $C^f(g)$ *is in the form (1.2) and has* $\delta_W \geq 2$. *The above holds modulo complete contractions of length* $\geq \sigma + 1$.

Assuming we can prove the above Lemma, we are reduced to proving Proposition 1.1 under the extra assumption that each $C^l(g), l \in L_\sigma$ has $\delta_W \geq 2$.

Lemma 1.3 *Assume that* $P(g) = \sum_{l\in L} a_l C^l(g)$ *satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 1.1; assume moreover that each* $C^l(g), l \in L_\sigma$ *has* $\delta_W \geq 2$. *Consider the index set* $L^{stack}_\sigma \subset L_\sigma$ *that consists of complete contractions in the form (1.2) that have all their* δ_W *internal contractions belonging to the same factor* $\nabla^{(m)} W_{ijkl}$.

We claim that there is a scalar conformal invariant $W(g)$ *and a vector field* $T^i(g) = \sum_{r\in R} a_r C^{r,i}(g)$ *of weight* $-n+1$ *(where each* $C^{r,i}(g)$ *is in the form (1.3)) so that:*

$$\sum_{l\in L^{stack}} a_l C^l(g) - W(g) - div_i T^i(g) = \sum_{j\in J} a_j C^j(g), \tag{1.13}$$

where each $C^j(g)$ *is in the form (1.2), has* $\delta_W \geq 2$ *and also at least two internal contractions belonging to different factors. The above holds modulo complete contractions of length* $\geq \sigma + 1$.

Next Claims: The divergence "piece" in $P(g)$**.**

For our next claim we will be assuming that for $P(g) = \sum_{l\in L} a_l C^l(g)$ (which satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 1.1), all complete contractions $C^l(g)$, $l \in L_\sigma$ are in the form (1.2) with $\delta_W \geq 2$ internal contractions, *and at least two internal contractions belong to different factors.*

Let $j = min_{l\in L_\sigma}\{\delta_W[C^l(g)]\}$. We define $L^j_\sigma \subset L_\sigma$ to stand for the index set of the complete contractions with $\delta_W = j$.

Lemma 1.4 *Assume that* $P(g) = \sum_{l\in L} a_l C^l(g)$ *satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 1.1; assume additionaly that all complete contractions* $C^l(g)$, $l \in L_\sigma$ *have* $\delta_W \geq 2$ *internal contractions and at least two of those internal contractions belong to different factors.*

We claim that there is a linear combination of partial contractions, $\sum_{h\in H} a_h C^{h,i}(g)$, *where each* $C^{h,i}(g)$ *is in the form (1.3) with weight* $-n+1$ *and* $\delta_W = j$, *so that:*

$$\sum_{l\in L^j_\sigma} a_l C^l(g) - div_i \sum_{h\in H} a_h C^{h,i}(g) = \sum_{v\in V} a_v C^v(g), \tag{1.14}$$

where each $C^v(g)$ is in the form (1.2) with $\delta_W \geq j+1$, and with at least two internal contractions in different factors. The above equation holds modulo complete contractions of length $\geq \sigma+1$.

Clearly, if we can show the above four Lemmas, Proposition 1.1 will follow: First applying the first three Lemmas to $P(g)$ to derive that there exists a local conformal invariant $W(g)$ and a divergence $div_iT^i(g)$ as claimed in Proposition 1.1 such that:

$$P(g) = W(g) + div_iT^i(g) + \sum_{l\in L'} a_l C^l(g) + \sum_{j\in J} a_j C^j(g);$$

here each $C^j(g)$ has length $\geq \sigma+1$; each $C^l(g), l \in L'$ has length σ and is in the form (1.2) and moreover has $\delta_W \geq 2$ internal contractions, at least two of which belong to different factors. Then, iteratively applying (1.4) to $P'(g) := P(g) - W(g) - div_iT^i(g)$,[14] we derive that there exists a divergence $div_iT'^i(g)$ as required by Proposition 1.1 such that:

$$\sum_{l\in L'} a_l C^l(g) = div_iT'^i(g) + \sum_{j\in J} a_j C^j(g),$$

where each $C^j(g)$ has length $\geq \sigma+1$. Therefore, the above four Lemmas indeed imply Proposition 1.1. We present the proofs of these four Lemmas in the remainder of this paper.

2 The locally conformally invariant "piece" in $P(g)$: A proof of Lemmas 1.1, 1.2, 1.3.

2.1 The Fefferman-Graham construction of local conformal invariants and an algorithm for computations.

We start with a brief discussion of the ambient metric of Fefferman and Graham, [17, 18] which we use to construct local conformal invariants. The ambient metric construction provides a canonical embedding of a Riemannian manifold (M^n, g) into an ambient Ricci-flat Lorentzian manifold $(\tilde{G}^{n+2}, \tilde{g}^{n+2})$. We refer the reader to the papers [17], [18] for a detailed exposition of this construction. We recall here a few features of this construction which will be useful to us: Recall that given coordinates $\{x^1, \dots, x^n\}$ for (M^n, g), then the ambient metric embedding provides a special coordinate system $\{x^0, x^1, \dots, x^n, x^{n+1}\}$ for the ambient manifold $(\tilde{G}^{n+2}, \tilde{g}^{n+2})$. More precisely, any given point $x_0 \in M^n$ is mapped to $\tilde{x}_0$ in $\tilde{G}^{n+2}$ with $x^0 = 1$ and $x^{n+1} = 0$. We denote the vectors in $T\tilde{G}|_{\tilde{x}_0}$ that correspond to the directions of $x^0, \dots, x^n, x^{n+1}$ by $X^0, \dots, X^n, X^\infty$ respectively. In what follows, we will often use the notion of "assigning of values" $_{0,1,\dots,n,\infty}$ to the (lower) indices of tensors. By this we will mean that we evaluate those (covariant) tensors against the vectors $X^0, \dots, X^\infty$.

---

[14] Notice that $\int_{M^n} P'(g)dV_g$ is *also* a global conformal invariant.

Now, let us furthermore recall that in the coordinate system $\{x^0, \dots x^{n+1}\}$ the ambient metric at $\tilde{x}_0$ is of the form:

$$\tilde{g}^{n+2}_{IJ} dx^I dx^J = 2dx^0 dx^{n+1} + g_{ij} dx^i dx^j, \tag{2.1}$$

where $0 \le I, J \le n+1$ and $1 \le i, j \le n$.

The Christoffel symbols of the ambient metric (evaluated with respect to this special coordinate system at a point with coordinates $(t, x^1, \dots, x^n, 0)$) are:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Gamma}^0_{IJ} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -tP_{ij} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \tilde{\Gamma}^k_{IJ} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & t^{-1}\delta_j{}^k & 0 \\ t^{-1}\delta_i{}^k & \Gamma^k_{ij} & g^{kl}P_{il} \\ 0 & g^{kl}P_{jl} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \tilde{\Gamma}^\infty_{IJ} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & t^{-1} \\ 0 & -g_{ij} & 0 \\ t^{-1} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Now, as proven in [17], [18], one can construct local conformal invariants by considering complete contractions involving the *ambient* curvature tensor $\tilde{R}$ and its *ambient* covariant derivatives (with respect to the Levi-Civita connection $\tilde{\nabla}$ of the ambient metric). In other words, Fefferman and Graham proved that any linear combination of complete contractions (of weight $-n$) in the form:

$$contr(\tilde{\nabla}^{(m_1)}_{r_1 \dots r_{m_1}} \tilde{R}_{i_1 j_1 k_1 l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \tilde{\nabla}^{(m_s)}_{v_1 \dots v_{m_s}} \tilde{R}_{i_s j_s k_s l_s}), \tag{2.3}$$

say $L(\tilde{g}) = \sum_{h \in H} a_h C^h(\tilde{g})$, is *by construction* a local conformal invariant of weight $-n$.[15] In particular, $L(\tilde{g})$ can *also* be expressed a linear combination of complete contractions in the form (1.2), involving covariant derivatives of the curvature tensor of the metric g, so $L(\tilde{g}) = F(g)$, where $F(g) := \sum_{h \in H} a_h contr^h(\nabla^{(m)} R \otimes \dots \otimes \nabla^{(m')} R)$. Furthermore, for any function $\lambda > 0$, we will have $F(\lambda^2 \cdot g) = \lambda^{-n} F(g)$.

In the rest of this subsection we will seek to understand how a given complete contraction in the form (2.12) can be expressed as a linear combination of complete contractions of the form (1.2), involving covariant derivatives of the curvature tensor of the metric g.

From contractions in the ambient metric $\tilde{g}$ to contractions in the base metric g:

We do this in steps. Consider any complete contraction $C(\tilde{g}^{n+2})$ in the form (2.12), of weight $-n$. We denote by $\tilde{\nabla}$ the Levi-Civita connection of $\tilde{g}$ and by ∇ the Levi-Civita connection of g.

---

[15] When n is even, the jet of the ambient metric at $\tilde{x}^0$ is only defined up to order $\frac{n}{2} - 1$. In our constructions, this restriction will always be fulfilled.

Our aim is to write $C(\tilde{g}^{n+2})$ as a linear combination of complete contractions (*with respect to the metric* g) of the form:

$$contr_g(T^{\alpha_1} \otimes \dots \otimes T^{\alpha_y} \otimes F^{\beta_1} \otimes F^{\beta_w}), \tag{2.4}$$

where the factors T^α are all in the form $\nabla^{(m)} W$ (so each T^α is an iterated covariant derivative of the Weyl tensor), all of whose $(m+4)$ indices are being contracted against another index in $contr_g(\dots)$. Each factor F^β is in the form $\nabla^{(a)} \tilde{\nabla}^{(q)} \tilde{R}$,[16] where $\delta > 0$ of its indices have a (fixed) value $_\infty$, $\epsilon \geq 0$ of its indices have a value $_0$ and the rest of its indices are being contracted (*with respect to the metric* g) against some other index in (2.4).

We discuss how any complete contraction $contr_{\tilde{g}}(\tilde{\nabla}^{(m_1)} \tilde{R} \otimes \dots \otimes \tilde{\nabla}^{(m_p)} \tilde{R})$ can be written as a linear combination of contractions in the form (2.4). This is a two step-procedure:

Consider any complete contraction $C(\tilde{g}^{n+2})$ in the ambient metric. Firstly we define the set of *assignments*, $ASSIGN$:

Definition 2.1 *An element* $ass \in ASSIGN$ *is a rule that acts by picking out each particular contraction between indices* $({}_a, {}_b)$ *and assigning to that pair of indices either the values* $({}_\infty, {}_0)$ *or the values* $({}_0, {}_\infty)$ *or repeatedly assigning any pair of numbers* ${}_i, {}_j$, $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ *and then multiplying by* g^{ij} *and summing over all such pairs. For each assignment* $ass \in ASSIGN$ *we obtain a complete contraction (in the metric* g*) involving tensors* $\tilde{\nabla}^{(m)} \tilde{R}$*; we denote this complete contraction* $ass[C(\tilde{g}^{n+2})]$*.*

Thus, for each element $ass \in ASSIGN$ $ass[C(\tilde{g}^{n+2})]$ is a complete contraction in the quadratic form g^{ij} (denote it by $contr_g(T^1 \otimes \dots \otimes T^s)$) where the factors T^i are tensors $\tilde{\nabla}^{(m)} \tilde{R}$ with some indices having the (fixed) value $_\infty$, some having the (fixed) value $_0$ and all the rest of the indices are being contracted against each other with respect to the metric g^{ij}. (Note: when we separately consider a tensor T^i in the contraction $contr_g(T^1 \otimes \dots \otimes T^s)$ we will call the indices of the third kind above "free" indices; in $contr_g(T^1 \otimes \dots \otimes T^s)$ these can only be assigned values ${}_1, \dots, {}_n$). It follows that we can write:

$$C(\tilde{g}^{n+2}) = \sum_{ass \in ASSIGN} ass[C(\tilde{g}^{n+2})]. \tag{2.5}$$

Now, the next step is to write out each $ass[C(\tilde{g}^{n+2})]$ as a linear combination of contractions in the form (2.4) (modulo a linear combination of contractions with length $\geq \sigma + 1$ which we do not care about). In order to do that, we will pick out each tensor $T = \tilde{\nabla}^{(m)}_{r_1 \dots r_m} \tilde{R}_{ijkl}$ in $ass[C(\tilde{g}^{n+2})]$ (recall that each of the indices ${}_{r_1}, \dots, {}_{r_m}, {}_i, {}_j, {}_k, {}_l$ either has a (fixed) value $_0$ or $_\infty$, or is a free index that may take any values between ${}_1, \dots, {}_n$). We denote by $\{{}_{u_1}, \dots, {}_{u_t}\} \subset \{{}_{r_1}, \dots, {}_{r_m}, {}_i, {}_j, {}_k, {}_l\}$ the set of free indices in T (i.e. the indices that may take

---

[16] ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection of g and $\tilde{\nabla}$ is the Levi-Civita connection of $\tilde{g}$.

values between $_1, \dots, _n$). We will write $T_{u_1 \dots u_t}$ to stress the fact that the free indices in T that are being contracted (with respect to the metric g^{ij}) against other indices in $ass[C(\tilde{g}^{n+2})]$ are precisely the indices $_{u_1}, \dots, _{u_t}$.
Step 2: We claim that $T_{u_1 \dots u_t}$ can be expressed in the form:

$$T_{u_1 \dots u_t} = \sum_{f=1}^{F} a_f T^f_{u_1 \dots u_t}(g), \tag{2.6}$$

where each of the terms $T^f_{u_1 \dots u_t}(g)$[17] is a tensor product with free indices $_{u_1}, \dots, _{u_t}$ in one of two forms: Either $T^f_{u_1 \dots u_t}(g)$ will be a tensor product:[18]

$$\nabla^{(b)}_{c_1 \dots c_b} \tilde{\nabla}^{(q)}_{f_1 \dots f_q} \tilde{R}_{zxcv} \otimes g_{ab} \otimes \dots \otimes g_{a'b'} \tag{2.7}$$

for which at least one index in the tensor $\tilde{\nabla}^{(q)} \tilde{R}_{ijkl}$ *has the value* $_\infty$, or it will just be a tensor of the form:

$$\nabla^{(d)}_{f_1 \dots f_d} W_{zxcv}. \tag{2.8}$$

Proof of (2.6): Firstly, if $T_{u_1 \dots u_t}$ has an index with value $_\infty$, there is nothing to prove, since we are in the first of the two desired forms. Thus, we only have to study the case where all the indices $_{r_1}, \dots, , _{r_{m+4}}$ have values between $_0$ and $_n$. We will then show by induction how $T_{u_1 \dots u_t}$ can be written as a linear combination in the form (2.6): We assume that we are able to write out any factor $T_{u_1 \dots u_t} (= \tilde{\nabla}^{(m)} \tilde{R})$ as in (2.6) provided $m \leq d$. We now show how we can do this for $m = d + 1$:

We consider $T_{u_1 \dots u_t} = \tilde{\nabla}^{(d+1)}_{r_1 \dots r_{d+1}} \tilde{R}_{r_{d+2} r_{d+3} r_{d+4} r_{d+5}}$ and we distinguish cases based on the *value* of the index $_{r_1}$: If $_{r_1}$ has the value $_0$, we then just denote by d^* the number of the indices $_{r_2}, \dots, _{r_{d+5}}$ that do *not* have the value $_0$. It then follows that $T_{u_1 \dots u_t} = (-d^* + 2) \tilde{\nabla}^{(d)}_{r_2 \dots r_d} \tilde{R}_{r_{d+2} r_{d+3} r_{d+4} r_{d+5}}$. Thus we are done, by our inductive hypothesis.

On the other hand, if the index $_{r_1}$ is a free index (allowed to take values $_1, \dots, _n$), we then denote by $\{a_1, \dots a_z\} \subset \{2, \dots d + 5\}$ the set of numbers for which the index $_{r_k}$, $k \in \{a_1, \dots a_z\}$ has been assigned the value $_0$. We also denote by $\{b_1 \dots, b_x\} \subset \{2, \dots d + 5\}$ the set of numbers for which $_{r_k}$, $k \in \{b_1 \dots, b_x\}$ is a free index (taking values between $_1, \dots, _n$). We then have:

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{\nabla}^{(d+1)}_{r_1 \dots r_{d+1}} \tilde{R}_{r_{d+2} r_{d+3} r_{d+4} r_{d+5}} = \nabla_{r_1} (\tilde{\nabla}^{(d)}_{r_2 \dots r_{d+1}} \tilde{R}_{r_{d+2} r_{d+3} r_{d+4} r_{d+5}}) \\ &- \sum_{k=1}^{z} \tilde{\nabla}^{(d)}_{r_2 \dots r_{a_k - 1} r_1 r_{a_k + 1} r_{d+1}} \tilde{R}_{r_{d+2} r_{d+3} r_{d+4} r_{d+5}} \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^{x} \tilde{\nabla}^{(d)}_{r_2 \dots r_{b_k - 1} \infty r_{b_k + 1} r_{d+1}} \tilde{R}_{r_{d+2} r_{d+3} r_{d+4} r_{d+5}} \otimes g_{r_1 r_{b_k}} + Q(R). \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

---

[17] Here ^{f} is a label, while $_{u_1}, \dots, _{u_t}$ are free indices.

[18] Recall ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection of g, and $\tilde{\nabla}$ is the Levi-Civita connection of $\tilde{g}^{n+2}$

(2.9) follows virtue of the Christoffel symbols $\tilde{\Gamma}^k_{0i} = \delta^k_i$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}^\infty_{ij} = -g_{ij}$.

Now, observe that the tensors $\tilde{\nabla}^{(d)}_{r_2 \dots r_{b_k-1} \infty r_{b_k+1} r_{d+1}} \tilde{R}_{r_{d+2} r_{d+3} r_{d+4} r_{d+5}}$ are in our desired form (2.7) because they contain an index ${}_\infty$. Moreover, the tensors $(\tilde{\nabla}^{(d)}_{r_2 \dots r_{d+1}} \tilde{R}_{r_{d+2} r_{d+3} r_{d+4} r_{d+5}})$ and $\tilde{\nabla}^{(d)}_{r_2 \dots r_{a_k-1} r_1 r_{a_k+1} r_{d+1}} \tilde{R}_{r_{d+2} r_{d+3} r_{d+4} r_{d+5}}$ fall under our inductive hypothesis. Therefore, expressing these tensors as linear combinations of tensors in the form (2.7), (2.8) we derive that (2.6) follows by induction. □

This analysis of each of the tensors $T_{u_1 \dots u_t}$ allows us to analogously write each complete contraction $C(\tilde{g}^{n+2})$ as a sum of complete contractions in the form (2.4): We pick out each factor T^y $(y = 1, \dots, \sigma)$ and replace it by one of the summands T^y_r (times a coefficient) in (2.6). We then take the complete contraction (with respect to g^{ij}) of these new tensors T^y_f. The formal sum over all these substitutions will be denoted by $\sum_{\gamma \in BR_{ass}} \gamma\{C(\tilde{g}^{n+2})\}$. Therefore, using the above and (2.5) we derive a formula:

$$C(\tilde{g}^{n+2}) = \sum_{ass \in ASSIGN} \sum_{\gamma \in BR_{ass}} \gamma\{ass[C(\tilde{g}^{n+2})]\}; \tag{2.10}$$

(the symbol BR_{ass} serves to illustrate that we have first picked a particular assignment $ass \in ASSIGN$).

Finally, we introduce a definition.

.

Definition 2.2 *For each complete contraction $C^l(g)$ in the form:*

$$contr(\nabla^{(m_1)}_{r_1 \dots r_{m_1}} W_{i_1 j_1 k_1 l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \nabla^{(m_s)}_{v_1 \dots v_{m_s}} W_{i_s j_s k_s l_s}), \tag{2.11}$$

with each $m_a \le \frac{n-4}{2}$, we construct a complete contraction $Amb[C^l(g)]$ in the ambient metric:

$$contr(\tilde{\nabla}^{(m_1)}_{r_1 \dots r_{m_1}} \tilde{R}_{i_1 j_1 k_1 l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \tilde{\nabla}^{(m_s)}_{v_1 \dots v_{m_s}} \tilde{R}_{i_s j_s k_s l_s}); \tag{2.12}$$

this is related to $C^l(g)$ in the following way: Consider any two factors $T_a = \nabla^{(m_w)}_{x_1 \dots x_{m_w}} W_{i_w j_w k_w l_w}$ and $T_b = \nabla^{(m_z)}_{y_1 \dots y_{m_z}} W_{i_z j_z k_z l_z}$ in $C^l(g)$ (the a^{th} and b^{th} factors) and suppose that the k^{th} index in T_1 contracts against the l^{th} index in T_2. Then, we require that in $Amb[C^l]$ we will have two factors $\tilde{T}_a = \tilde{\nabla}^{(m_w)}_{x_1 \dots x_{m_w}} \tilde{R}_{i_w j_w k_w l_w}$ and $\tilde{T}_b = \tilde{\nabla}^{(m_z)}_{y_1 \dots y_{m_z}} \tilde{R}_{i_z j_z k_z l_z}$ in $C^l(\tilde{g}^{n+2})$ and furthermore the k^{th} index in $\tilde{T}_1$ will contract against the l^{th} index in $\tilde{T}_2$.

We will call the local conformal invariant $Amb[C(g)]$ the ambient analogue of $C(g)$.

Note: Since we are assuming $m_a \le \frac{n-4}{2}$, we know by [17], [18] that the above ambient complete contraction is well-defined.

2.2 Proof of Lemma 1.1:

In order to prove this Lemma, let us consider the linear combination $\Sigma_{l\in L^0_\sigma} a_l C^l(g)$. We claim that the local conformal invariant needed for the proof of Lemma 1.1 is precisely $W(g) := \sum_{l\in L} a_l Amb[C^l(g)]$.[19] This will follow by virtue of the following Lemma:

Lemma 2.1 *Given any $C^l(g)$ in the form (1.2) with no internal contractions, we claim:*

$$C^l(g) - Amb[C^l] = \sum_{t\in T} a_t C^t(g),$$

where each $C^t(g)$ either has length $\geq \sigma + 1$ (and is in the form (1.1)), or is in the form (1.2) and has length σ and $\delta_W \geq 1$.

Proof: Recall the algorithm from the previous subsection. Recall the equation (2.10). Let $ass^* \in ASSIGN$ be the (unique) assignment where *no* index in the complete contraction $Amb[C^l(g)]$ is assigned the value ∞.[20] Firstly we claim that for every $ass \in ASSIGN \setminus \{ass^*\}$:

$$\sum_{\gamma\in BR_{ass}} \gamma\{ass[C(\tilde{g}^{n+2})]\} = \sum_{t\in T} a_t C^t(g), \tag{2.13}$$

where the RHS is as in the claim of Lemma 2.1. To see this, recall the algorithm from the previous subsection. Observe that $ass[C(\tilde{g}^{n+2})]$ stands for a complete contraction (with respect to the metric g^{ij}) of factors $\tilde{\nabla}^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}\tilde{R}_{ijkl}$, *and at least one of those factors has an index with the (fixed) value* $_\infty$; it then follows from the higher-order Taylor expansion of the ambient metric $\tilde{g}$ (see [17], [18]) that such a tensor $T_{i_1\dots i_f}$, can be written out in terms of the metric g as follows:

$$T_{i_1\dots i_f} = \sum \nabla^{(m)} W_{ijkl} + \sum T'_{i_1\dots i_f},$$

where each tensor $\nabla^{(m)} W_{ijkl}$ has f free lower indices, $m+4 > f$ and the rest of the indices are internally contracting. Moreover, *there will be* at least one internal contraction in $\nabla^{(m)} W_{ijkl}$. $\sum T'_{i_1\dots i_f}$ stands for a linear combination of partial contractions in the form:

$$pcontr(\nabla^{(m_1)} R_{ijkl} \otimes \dots \otimes \nabla^{(m_w)} R_{i'j'k'l'} \otimes g_{ab} \otimes \dots \otimes g_{a'b'}) \tag{2.14}$$

with $w \geq 2$ (i.e. with at least two factors $\nabla^{(m)} R$). Substituting this expression into $\sum_{\gamma\in BR_{ass}} \gamma\{ass[C(\tilde{g}^{n+2})]\}$ we derive (2.13).

So we are reduced to considering $\sum_{\gamma\in BR_{ass^*}} \gamma\{ass^*[C(\tilde{g}^{n+2})]\}$. That is, we are reduced to considering the case where *no index* in the complete contraction $C^l(\tilde{g}^{n+2})$ is assigned the value $_0$ or $_\infty$. But then recall the Christoffel symbols $\tilde{\Gamma}^k_{ij}$ for the ambient metric $\tilde{g}^{n+2}$:

---

[19] See Definition 2.2.

[20] Equivalently, ass^* is the unique assignment where no particular contraction $(_a, _b)$ is assigned the values $(_\infty, _0)$ or $(_0, _\infty)$.

If $1 \leq i, j, k \leq n$ we have $\tilde{\Gamma}^k_{ij} = \Gamma^k_{ij}$. On the other hand, $\tilde{\Gamma}^0_{ij} = P_{ij}$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}^{n+1}_{ij} = -g_{ij}$. Thus we derive that for values ${}_{r_1}, \dots, {}_{l} \in \{{}_1, \dots, {}_n\}$:

$$\tilde{\nabla}^{(m)}_{r_1 \dots r_m} \tilde{R}_{ijkl} = \nabla^{(m)}_{r_1 \dots r_m} W_{ijkl} + T_{r_1 \dots r_m ijkl} + T'_{r_1 \dots r_m ijkl}, \tag{2.15}$$

where $T_{r_1 \dots r_m ijkl}$ is a linear combination of tensor fields of the form $g_{ab} \otimes \dots \otimes g_{cd} \otimes \tilde{\nabla}^{(p)} \tilde{R}_{ijkl}$, where the factor $\tilde{\nabla}^{(p)} \tilde{R}_{ijkl}$ contains at least one index with a value ${}_\infty$. $T'_{r_1 \dots r_m ijkl}$ stands for a linear combination of tensor fields of the form (2.14) with $w \geq 2$.

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.1. □

2.3 Proof of Lemma 1.2: Proof of half the Lemma.

We prove Lemma 1.2 in two steps. In order to explain this proof, we need one piece of notation:

Definition 2.3 *Consider a complete contraction $C(g)$ in the form (1.2) with weight $-n+2$. We define $\Delta^k_r[C(g)]$, for any $k, 1 \leq k \leq \sigma$ to be the complete contraction that arises from $C(g)$ by picking out its k^{th} factor F_k and replacing it by ΔF_k. Then, we define:*

$$\Delta_r[C(g)] = \sum_{k=1}^{\sigma} \Delta^k_r[C(g)]$$

This operation extends to linear combinations.

Lemma 1.2 will follow by the next two claims:

Lemma 2.2 *Under the assumptions of Lemma 1.2 we claim that there is a vector field $T^i(g) = \sum_{r \in R} a_r C^{r,i}(g)$ (of the form required by Lemma 1.2) so that:*

$$\sum_{l \in L^1_\sigma} a_l C^l(g) - div_i \sum_{r \in R} a_r C^{r,i}(g) = \Delta_r[\sum_{v \in V} a_v C^v(g)] + \sum_{f \in F} a_f C^f(g), \tag{2.16}$$

modulo complete contractions of length $\geq \sigma + 1$. Here each $C^f(g)$ is in the form (1.2) with length σ and $\delta_W \geq 2$. On the other hand, each $C^v(g)$ is in the form (1.2) with length σ, weight $-n+2$ and with no internal contractions.

The next claim starts with the conclusion of the previous one:

Lemma 2.3 *Assume that $P(g)$ is as in the assumption of Lemma 1.2; assume furthermore that the sublinear combination $\sum_{l \in L^1} a_l C^l(g)$ of contractions with length σ and precisely one internal contraction can be expressed in the form $\sum_{l \in L^1} a_l C^l(g) = \sum_{v \in V} a_v \Delta_r[C^v(g)]$.*

We claim that there is a local conformal invariant $W(g)$ and a vector field $\sum_{r \in R} a_r C^{r,i}(g)$ of weight $-n+1$ so that:

$$\Delta_r[\sum_{v\in V} a_v C^v(g)] - W(g) - div_i \sum_{r\in R} a_r C^{r,i}(g) = \sum_{f\in F} a_f C^f(g). \tag{2.17}$$

The above holds modulo complete contractions of length $\sigma+1$. *Here again each* $C^f(g)$ *is in the form (1.2) with length* σ *and* $\delta_W \geq 2$.

Proof of Lemma 2.2: In order to prove this Lemma, we first slightly manipulate the sublinear combination $\sum_{l\in L^1_\sigma} a_l C^l(g)$ in $P(g)$:

We first prove that by subtracting divergences from $P(g)$, we may assume that every complete contraction $C^l(g)$ with $l \in L^1_\sigma$ will have its internal contraction in a factor of the form $\nabla_l W_{ijk}{}^l$:

This is done as follows: For each complete contraction $C^l(g)$, $l \in L^1_\sigma$, we isolate the one factor $\nabla^{(m_a)}_{r_1\dots r_{m_a}} W_{ijkl}$ which contains the internal contraction (there can be only one such factor, by the definition of L^1_σ). Then, if the internal contraction is between two indices ${}_{r_s}, {}_{r_t}$, we bring them to the positions ${}_{r_{m_a-1}}, {}_{r_{m_a}}$ by repeatedly applying the curvature identity. That way we introduce correction terms that have length at least $\sigma+1$. Then, we apply the identity

$$\nabla_r W_{ijkl} + \nabla_j W_{rikl} + \nabla_i W_{jrkl} = \sum(\nabla^s W_{srty} \otimes g), \tag{2.18}$$

(see subsection 2.3 [3]–recall that the symbol $\sum(\nabla^s W_{srty} \otimes g)$ stands for a linear combination of a tensor product of the three-tensor $\nabla^s W_{sqty}$ with an un-contracted metric tensor).

Thus (modulo introducing correction terms that are allowed in Lemma 2.2), we may assume that in each complete contraction $C^l(g)$, $l \in L^1$ the internally contracting factor is of the form $\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_{m-1}l} W_{ijk}{}^l$. Finally, we subtract divergences from $C^l(g)$ as in the proof of the silly divergence formula in [1], in order to arrange that all complete contractions $C^l(g), l \in L^1_\sigma$ have the internal contraction in a factor of the form $\nabla_l W_{ijk}{}^l$ (this can be done modulo introducing complete contractions with more than one internal contractions–but these are allowed in the conclusion of our Lemma).

We note the transformation law for the factor $\nabla^l W_{ijkl}$ under the re-scaling $\hat{g} = e^{2\phi(x)} g$.

$$(\nabla^l W_{ijkl})_{\hat{g}} = (\nabla^l W_{ijkl})_g + (n-3)[W_{ijkl}\nabla^l \phi]_g. \tag{2.19}$$

Now, consider $I^1_g(\phi)(:= Image^1_\phi[P(g)])$.[21] We firstly study the sublinear combination $Image^1_\phi[P(g)]|_\sigma]$.[22]

Initially, we write $Image^1_\phi[P(g)|_\sigma]$ out as a linear combination of complete contractions in the form:

---

[21] Recall that $Image^1_\phi[P(g)] := \frac{d}{dt}|_{t=0} e^{nt\phi} P(e^{2t\phi} g)$ and that $\int_{M^n} I^1_g(\phi) dV_g = 0$.

[22] Recall that $P(g)|_\sigma$ stands for the sublinear combination of terms in $P(g)$ with length σ. Those terms are indexed in $L_\sigma \subset L$. Recall that $Image^1[P(g)_\sigma](:=)\frac{d}{dt}|_{t=0} e^{nt\phi} \sum_{l\in L_\sigma} a_l C^l(e^{2t\phi} g)$.

$$contr(\nabla^{(m_1)}W_{ijkl}\otimes\dots\otimes\nabla^{(m_\sigma)}W_{i'j'k'l'}\otimes\nabla^{(\nu)}\phi). \tag{2.20}$$

Given that $P(g)|_\sigma$ is a linear combination of complete contractions in the from (1.2), we immediately obtain such an expression for $Image^1_\phi[P(g)|_\sigma]$, by applying the transformation laws from the Weyl tensor and the Levi-Civita connection, see the subsection 2.3 in [3]. Thus we write

$$Image^1_\phi[P(g)|_\sigma]=\Sigma_{k\in K}a_kC^k_g(\phi),$$

where each $C^k_g(\phi)$ is in the form (2.20) with length $\sigma+1$.

Now, we re-express $Image^1_\phi[P(g)|_\sigma]$ as a linear combination of complete contractions in the form:

$$contr(\nabla^{(m_1)}R\otimes\dots\otimes\nabla^{(m_\sigma)}R\otimes\nabla^{(\nu)}\phi) \tag{2.21}$$

($\nabla^{(m)}R$ above stands for the differentiated curvature tensor, where we do not write out the indices). This is done by picking out each complete contraction $C^k_g(\phi)$ in the above equation and decomposing each Weyl tensor according to $W_{ijkl}=R_{ijkl}+[P\wedge g]$ (see subsection 2.3 in [3]). Hence, we write out:

$$Image^1_\phi[P(g)|_\sigma]=\Sigma_{k\in K}a_k[\Sigma_{w\in W_k}a_wC^{k,w}_g(\phi)].$$

Each complete contraction $C^{k,w}_g(\phi)$ is in the form (2.21).

Now, we introduce some definitions regarding complete contractions $C_g(\phi)$ of the form (2.21).

Definition 2.4 *For any complete contraction $C_g(\phi)$, δ will stand for the number of internal contractions among its factors $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$, $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$, $\nabla^{(y)}R$ (including the one (resp. two) internal contractions in the term $Ric_{ij}=R^a{}_{iaj}$, $R=R^{ab}{}_{ab}$). q will stand for the number of factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$, R (scalar curvature).*

Definition 2.5 *Consider complete contractions $C_g(\phi)$ in the form (2.21). ν will stand for the number of derivatives on the factor $\nabla^{(\nu)}\phi$.*

Any such complete contraction with $q=\delta=0$ and $\nu=1$ will be called a target. Any complete contraction with $\nu\geq 2$ and $\nabla^{(\nu)}_{r_1\dots r_\nu}\phi\neq\Delta\phi$ will be called irrelevant. Any complete contraction with $\nu=1$ and $q+\delta>0$ will be called a contributor.

Now, we consider complete contractions in the form (2.21) of length $\sigma+1$ with a factor $\Delta\phi$. If $q=\delta=0$, we will call it dangerous. If $\delta+q>0$ we will call it a contributor. Finally, any complete contraction of length $\geq\sigma+2$ will be called irrelevant.

In the rest of this subsection, $J_g(\phi)$ will stand for a generic linear combination of contributors and irrelevant complete contractions.

Our next aim is to understand $Image^1_\phi[C^l(g)]$ for $l\in L^1_\sigma$. We will need some definitions:

Definition 2.6 *Consider a complete contraction* $C^l_g(\phi)$, $l \in L^1_\sigma$ *which is in the form (1.2) and has its internal contraction in a factor* $\nabla^l W_{ijkl}$. *We define the skeleton* $C^{l,\iota}_g(\phi)$ *of* $C^l(g)$ *to be the complete contraction which is obtained from* $C^l(g)$ *by substituting the factor* $\nabla_l W_{ijk}{}^l$ *by* $\nabla_l \phi R_{ijk}{}^l$ *and every other factor* $\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m} W_{ijkl}$ *by* $\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m} R_{ijkl}$.

Also, consider any complete contraction $C^l(g)$ *which is in the form (1.2) (not necessarily of weight* $-n$*) with* $q = 0$ *and* $\delta = 0$. *We then define its skeleton* $C^{l,\iota}(g)$ *to be the complete contraction which is obtained from it by substituting each factor* $\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m} W_{ijkl}$ *by* $\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m} R_{ijkl}$.

Lemma 2.4 *For any complete contraction* $C^l(g)$ *with* $l \in L^1_\sigma$, *we claim that* $Image^1_\phi[C^l(g)]$ *can be expressed as follows:*

$$Image^1_\phi[C^l(g)] = (n-3)C^{l,\iota}_g(\phi) + J_g(\phi). \tag{2.22}$$

Proof: This is proven in two steps:

We first consider the complete contraction in $Image^1_\phi[C^l(g)]$ which arises as follows: We first substitute the factor $\nabla^l W_{ijkl}$ in $C^l(g)$ by $(n-3)W_{ijkl}\nabla^l\phi$. Let us denote the complete contraction that we obtain thus by $C^l_g(\phi)$. Then, we write $C^l_g(\phi)$ as a linear combination of complete contractions in the form (2.21):

$$C^l_g(\phi) = \Sigma^F_{t=1} a_t C^{l,t}_g(\phi)$$

Let us assume that $C^{l,1}_g(\phi)$ is obtained from $C^l_g(\phi)$ by substituting each factor $\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m} W_{ijkl}$ by a factor $\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m} R_{ijkl}$. The complete contractions $C^{l,t}_g(\phi)$ with $t \ge 2$ arise by substituting at least one factor $\nabla^{(m)} W_{ijkl}$ in $C^l_g(\phi)$ by a factor $\nabla^{(m)}[Ric \otimes g]$ or $\nabla^{(m)}[R \otimes g \cdots \otimes g]$. Hence, each complete contraction $C^{l,t}_g(\phi)$ with $t \ge 2$ will either have $q > 0$ or $\delta > 0$, so it will be a contributor. We see that the complete contraction $C^{l,1}_g(\phi)$ above is $(n-3) \cdot C^{l,\iota}_g(\phi)$.

Let us now consider any complete contraction $C^{l'}_g(\phi)$ (in the form) (2.20) in $Image^1_\phi[C^l(g)]$ other than $C^{l,1}_g(\phi)$. Then necessarily $C^{l'}_g(\phi)$ has arisen by applying the transformation laws for the Levi-Civita connection or the Weyl tensor to any indices in $C^l(g)$ other than the internal contraction in the factor $\nabla^l W_{ijkl}$. Hence $C^{l'}_g(\phi)$ will contain a factor $\nabla^l W_{ijkl}$, which still has an internal contraction. Therefore, writing $C^{l'}_g(\phi)$ as a linear combination of complete contractions in the form (2.21), as below:

$$C^{l'}_g(\phi) = \Sigma_{r \in R} C^{l',r}_g(\phi)$$

we have that each $C^{l',r}_g(\phi)$ will either have a factor $\nabla^{(m)} R_{ijkl}$ with an internal contraction or a factor $\nabla^{(p)} Ric$ or a factor R (scalar curvature). Therefore, each such complete contraction $C^{l',r}_g(\phi)$ is either a contributor or irrelevant. □

By the same calculations we also derive:

Lemma 2.5 *For any complete contraction $C^l(g)$ with $l \in L_\sigma \setminus L^1_\sigma$:*

$$Image^1_\phi[C^l(g)] = J_g(\phi). \tag{2.23}$$

Proof: This fact follows by the same proof as for the previous Lemma. □

Lemma 2.6 *Consider the sublinear combination $P(g)|_{\sigma+1}$ in $P(g)$. Then:*

$$Image^1_\phi[P(g)|_{\sigma+1}] = \sum_{u\in U} a_u C^u(g)\Delta\phi + J_g(\phi), \tag{2.24}$$

where $\sum_{u\in U} a_u C^u(g)\Delta\phi$ stands for a generic linear combination of dangerous complete contractions.

Proof: Straightforward from the transforation laws of the Levi-Civita connection and the curvature tensor under conformal re-scalings. (These can be found in subsection 2.3 in [3]). □

We are now ready to get to the main part of proving Lemma 2.2. It will be useful to recall a few facts about the super divergence formula from [1]. This is the second and last instance in this series of papers where we make use of the super divergence formula in full strength. In all other instances we use the "main consequence" of the super divergence formula, as codified in subsection 2.2 in [3].

A few facts about the super divergence formula: We apply the super divergence formula to the operator $I^1_g(\phi) = \sum_{l\in L} a_l C^l(g)$. Recall that $\int_{M^n} I^1_g(\phi)dV_g = 0$ for every compact (M^n, g), $\phi \in C^\infty(M^n)$ and each $C^l(g)$ is in the form (2.21). The super divergence formula applied to $I^1_g(\phi)$ provides a local formula which expresses $I^1_g(\phi)$ as a divergence of a vector field. We recall that there is a process by which each term $C^l(g)$ in $I^1_g(\phi)$ gives rise to divergences in the super divergence formula. In the end of [1] we summarized the conclusion of the super divergence formula as follows: Given $I^1_g(\phi) = \sum_{l\in L} a_l C^l_g(\phi)$ we introduces the notion of "descendents" of each $C^l(g), l \in L$; these are complete contractions involving factors $\vec{\xi}$ (or covariant derivatives thereof). Such complete contractions are divided up into categories (e.g. "good", "hard", "undecided") and we then proceed by integrating by parts the factors $\vec{\xi}$ in those complete contractions. At each stage, we *discard* complete contractions which are "bad", "hard" or "stigmatized". In the end each complete contraction $C^l_g(\phi)$ in $I^1_g(\phi)$ contributes itself plus a linear combination of divergences to the super divergence formula; we have denoted this sum by $Tail[C^l(g)]$. In other words, the super diveregnce formula can be summarized as:

$$\sum_{l\in L} a_l Tail[C^l(g)] = 0. \tag{2.25}$$

The only further remarks we wish to make is that if $C^l_g(\phi)$ has length $\geq \sigma + 2$ then $Tail[C^l_g(\phi)$ consists of complete contractions with length $\geq \sigma+2$, and that for every complete contraction $C^l_g(\phi)$ of length $\sigma+1$ the only way that the factor $\nabla^{(\nu)}\phi$ in a complete contraction $C^l_g(\phi)$ can give rise to a factor $\vec{\xi}$ is by replacing a pair of indices ${}_{r_s}, {}_{r_t}$ in the factor $\nabla^{(\nu)}_{r_1\dots r_\nu}\phi$ that contract against each other by an expression ${}_{r_t}\vec{\xi}^{r_t}$. This factor $\vec{\xi}^{r_t}$ will then be integrated by parts, giving rise to a divergence with respect to the index ${}_{r_t}$.

Our Lemma will follow by picking out a particular "piece" in the super divergence formula *which vanishes separately* and then applying the operation $Weylify$ (from subsection 5.1 in [3]) to the resulting equation:

Lemma 2.7 *Consider any irrelevant complete contraction $C^l_g(\phi)$. Then:*

$$Tail[C^l_g(\phi)] = \Sigma_{w\in W} C^w_g(\phi),$$

where each complete contraction $C^w_g(\phi)$ has length $\geq \sigma+1$, and if $C^w_g(\phi)$ does have length $\sigma+1$ then it is irrelevant.

Proof: If $C^l_g(\phi)$ has length $\geq \sigma+2$ then $Tail[C^l_g(\phi)]$ consists of terms with length $\geq \sigma+2$, so we are done. Now, the case where $C^l_g(\phi)$ has length $\sigma+1$: By our definition, a complete contraction of length $\sigma+1$ is irrelevant if it has a factor $\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}\phi \neq \Delta\phi$. But then, by virtue of the Lemma 16 in [1] and the iterative integration by parts, it follows that each complete contraction in $Tail[C^l_g(\phi)]$ of length $\sigma+1$ will have a factor $\nabla^{(p)}_{r_1\dots r_p}\phi, p\geq 2$. Hence each complete contraction of length $\sigma+1$ in $Tail[C^l_g(\phi)]$ is irrelevant. $\Box$

We next consider $Tail[C^l_g(\phi)]$ when $C^l_g(\phi)$ is a contributor. (By definition if $C^l_g(\phi)$ is a contributor, then its factor $\nabla^{(p)}\phi$ is either of the form $\nabla\phi$ or $\Delta\phi$).

We claim the following:

Lemma 2.8 *Consider any contributor $C^l_g(\phi)$. Modulo complete contractions of length $\geq \sigma+2$, we can write $Tail[C^l_g(\phi)]$ as a linear combination:*

$$Tail[C^l_g(\phi)] = C^l_g(\phi) + \Sigma_{r\in R_l} a_r div_{j_r} C^{j_r}_g(\phi) + \Sigma_{w\in W} a_w C^w_g(\phi), \qquad (2.26)$$

where each vector field $C^{l,j_r}_g(\phi)$ in the above equation is a partial contraction in the form (2.21) with length $\sigma+1$, with one free index, and furthermore $\nu=1$ (that is, it has a factor $\nabla_a\phi$), and the index ${}_a$ in $\nabla_a\phi$ is not the free index, and furthermore $q=\delta=0$; each complete contraction $C^w_g(\phi)$ is in the form (2.21) with either $\nu\geq 2$ or $q+\delta>0$.

Proof of Lemma 2.8: First consider the case where $C^l(g)$ contains a factor $\nabla\phi$: By virtue of the algorithm for the super divergence formula (see the concluding remarks in [1]), we derive that, modulo complete contractions of length $\geq \sigma+2$:

$$Tail[C^l_g(\phi)] = C^l_g(\phi) - \Sigma_{f\in F} div_{i_f} C^{l,i_f}_g(\phi),$$

where $\Sigma_{f\in F} C^{l,i_f}_g(\phi)$ is a linear combination of vector fields in the form (2.21) with $\nu \geq 1$; if $\nu = 1$ then the index ${}_a$ in $\nabla_a\phi$ *is not* the free index ${}_{i_f}$ because $C^l_g(\phi)$ contains a factor $\nabla\phi$, therefore no descendent of $C^l_g(\phi)$ has a factor $\vec{\xi}$ contracting against $\nabla\phi$. Now, if a vector field $C^{l,i_f}_g(\phi)$ has $\nu = 1$ and no internal contractions, we index it in R_l. Otherwise, we place $div_{i_f} C^{l,i_f}_g(\phi)$ into the sum $\Sigma_{w\in W} a_w C^w_g(\phi)$. $\Box$

We now consider the case where $C^l_g(\phi)$ has a factor $\Delta\phi$. In that case, recall that by definition $\delta + q > 0$. We denote the set of good or undecided descendants of $C^l_g(\phi)$ by $\{C^{l,b}_g(\phi, \vec{\xi})\}_{b\in B}$. Also recall Lemma 16 from [1]. Now, if $C^{l,b}_g(\phi, \vec{\xi})$ contains a factor $\Delta\phi$, it follows from Lemma 20 in [1] that, modulo complete contractions of length $\geq \sigma + 2$:

$$PO[C^{l,b}_g(\phi, \vec{\xi})] = \Sigma_{t\in T} a_t C^t_g(\phi),$$

where each $C^t_g(\phi)$ is in the form (2.21) and has a factor $\nabla^{(\nu)}\phi, \nu \geq 2$. We then place the complete contractions $C^t_g(\phi)$ into the sum $\Sigma_{w\in W} a_w C^w_g(\phi)$.

If the $\vec{\xi}$-contraction $C^{l,b}_g(\phi, \vec{\xi})$ has a factor $\nabla_i\phi$, it follows from Lemma 16 in [1] that it will have an expression $\nabla_i\phi\vec{\xi}^i$. We then decree that the factor $\vec{\xi}^i$ will be the first to be integrated by parts.[23] Notice the following: If $\vec{\xi}^i$ was the only $\vec{\xi}$-factor in $C^{l,b}_g(\phi, \vec{\xi})$ is $\vec{\xi}^i$, then $C^{l,b}_g(\phi, \vec{\xi})$ is in the form (2.21) with at least one factor $\nabla^{(p)} Ric$ or R (of the scalar curvature). Hence, in that case we place $PO[C^{l,b}_g(\phi, \vec{\xi})]$ into the sum $\Sigma_{w\in W} a_w C^w_g(\phi)$.

If $C^{l,b}_g(\phi, \vec{\xi})$ has more $\vec{\xi}$-factors, then after the integration by parts of $\vec{\xi}^i$, we are reduced to the previous case. Thus our Lemma follows. $\Box$

Finally, let us consider a dangerous complete contraction $C^l_g(\phi)$. It will be in the form:

$$contr(\nabla^{(m_1)} R_{ijkl} \otimes \dots \otimes \nabla^{(m_\sigma)} R_{ijkl} \otimes \Delta\phi),$$

where none of the factors $\nabla^{(m)} R_{ijkl}$ have internal contractions. Hence, we derive:

$$Tail[C^l_g(\phi)] = -contr(\nabla^i[\nabla^{(m_1)} R_{ijkl} \otimes \dots \otimes \nabla^{(m_\sigma)} R_{ijkl}] \otimes \nabla_i\phi). \qquad (2.27)$$

We denote a linear combination as in the right hand side of the above by $\sum_{h\in H} a_h \nabla^j [C^h(g)] \nabla_j\phi$.

In view of the above Lemmas, we see that by applying the super divergence formula to $I^1_g(\phi)$, and pick out the sublinear combination with $\sigma + 1$ factors, with one factor $\nabla\phi$ and without internal contractions,[24] we derive a *new* local equation:

---

[23] Note that by the remark made in the subsection "Conclusion" in [1] we are free to impose this restriction.

$$\sum_{l\in L^1_\sigma} a_l C^{l,\iota}_g(\phi) + \sum_{r\in R} a_r X div_j C^{r,j}_g(\phi) = \sum_{h\in H} a_h \nabla^j [C^h(g)]\nabla_j \phi \tag{2.28}$$

Now, applying the operation $Weylify$ to the above, we derive our Lemma 2.2 (by virtue of the discussion on the operation $Weylify$ in subsection 5.1 in [3]). $\Box$

We will show Lemma 2.3 in the next section, after proving Lemma 1.3.

2.4 Proof of Lemmas 1.3 and 2.3 (the second half of Lemma 1.2).

This subsection contains elaborate constructions and calculations of local conformal invariants. All the divergences of vector fields that appear in the proofs of these two Lemmas are constructed explicitly; there is no recourse to the "super divergnece formula". The key to these constructions and to the calculations below is the ambient metric of Fefferman and Graham, see [17], [18]. We will be using the algorithm that was presented in subsection 2.1.

Proof of Lemma 1.3: For this section, for each complete contraction $C^l(g)$, $l \in L^{stack}$ we will call the factor to which all the internal contractions belong the *important factor*.

Firstly, we observe (easily) that by applying the fake second Bianchi identities from [3] (see (2.18) in this paper) we can write modulo terms of length $\geq \sigma + 1$:

$$\sum_{l\in \tilde{L}^{stack}} a_l C^l(g) = \sum_{l\in \overline{L}^{stack}} a_l C^l(g) + \sum_{j\in J} a_j C^j_g(\phi),$$

where each $C^l(g)$ $l \in \overline{L}^{stack}$ is in the form (1.2) and has two of its internal contractions involving the indices ${}_i, {}_k$ in the important factor $\nabla^{(m)}W_{ijkl}$;[25] also each $C^j(g)$ is in the form (1.2) and has at least two internal contractions belonging to *different* factors $\nabla^{(m)}W_{ijkl}$.

Thus we are reduced to proving our claim under the assumption that the important factor of each $C^l(g)$, $l \in L^{stack}$ is of the form $\nabla^{t_1\dots t_{\delta-2}ik}\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}W_{ijkl}$.

We then observe that by intergating by parts the indices ${}_{r_1}, \dots, {}_{r_m}$ in the factor $\nabla_{r_1\dots r_m}{}^{ik}W_{ijkl}$ for each $l \in L^{stack}$ we can explicitly construct a vector field $T^i(g) = \sum_{h\in H} a_h C^{h,i}(g)$ so that:

$$C^l(g) - div_i T^i(g) = \sum C^*(g) + \sum_{j\in J} a_j C^j(g), \tag{2.29}$$

---

[24] Notice that this sublinear combination must vanish separately.

[25] In other words, we have two derivative indices ∇^i, ∇^k contracting against the indices ${}_i, {}_k$ in the important factor

modulo complete contractions of length $\sigma+1$. Here $\sum C^*(g)$ stands for a linear combination of complete contractions in the form (1.2) with $\delta_W=2$, where both the internal contractions belong to a factor in the form $\nabla^{ik}W_{ijkl}$. Each $C^j(g)$ is a complete contraction in the form (1.2) with at least two internal contractions belonging to different factors. Now, abusing notation we will again denote $\sum_{l\in \overline{L}^{stack}} a_l C^l(g)$ by $\sum_{l\in L^{stack}} a_l C^l(g)$. Therefore, we are reduced to showing our Lemma in the case where each $C^l(g)$, $l\in L^{stack}$ has $\delta_W=2$ and the two internal contractions belong to an important factor in the form $\nabla^{ik}W_{ijkl}$.

In order to state our claim, we recall the *ambient analogue* $Amb[C(g)]$, of any complete contraction in the from (1.2) (see Definition 2.2); we also introduce a new definition:

Definition 2.7 *Consider any $C^l(g)$, $l\in L^{stack}$ in the form (1.2), where there are precisely two internal contractions in $C^l(g)$, in some factor $\nabla^{ik}W_{ijkl}$. We let $C^{l,i_1i_2}(g)$ be the tensor field that arises from $C^l(g)$ by making the two internal contractions into free indices.*

We also let $C^{l,i_1}(g)$ be the vector field that arises from $C^l(g)$ by replacing the important factor $\nabla^{ik}W_{ijkl}$ by $\nabla^k W_{i_1jkl}$ and $C^{l,i_2}(g)$ be the vector field that arises from $C^l(g)$ by replacing the important factor $\nabla^{ik}W_{ijkl}$ by $\nabla^i W_{iji_2l}$.

Lemma 2.9 *Consider the tensor field $C^{l,i_1i_2}(g)$; consider $Xdiv_{i_1}Xdiv_{i_2}C^{l,i_1i_2}(g)$ and construct $Amb[Xdiv_{i_1}Xdiv_{i_2}C^{l,i_1i_2}(g)]$. We claim that modulo terms of length $\geq\sigma+1$:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&Amb[Xdiv_{i_1}Xdiv_{i_2}C^{l,i_1i_2}(g)]=Xdiv_{i_1}Xdiv_{i_2}C^{l,i_1i_2}(g)+\frac{n-4}{n-3}Xdiv_{i_1}C^{l,i_1}(g)\\
&+\frac{n-4}{n-3}Xdiv_{i_2}C^{l,i_2}(g)+\frac{(n-4)^2-2(n-4)+2}{(n-3)(n-4)}C^l(g)+\sum_{j\in J}a_jC^j(g)+\\
&\sum_{t\in T^\sharp}a_tXdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{a_t}}C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g)+\sum_{t\in T^{\sharp\sharp}}a_tXdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{a_t}}C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g).
\end{aligned}\tag{2.30}$$

Here each tensor field $C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g)$, $t\in T^\sharp$ is in the form (1.2), has $\delta_W>0$ and at least one of the free indices belongs to a factor T_1, and at least one internal contraction belongs to a factor T_2 with $T_1\neq T_2$. Each tensor field $C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g)$, $t\in T^{\sharp\sharp}$ also has $\delta_W>0$ and in addition has a factor $T=\nabla^{(m)}W_{ijkl}$ with one internal contraction between a derivative index and an index ${}_i$ or ${}_k$ and then one of the free indices ${}_{i_1},\dots,{}_{i_{a_t}}$ is the index ${}_j$ or ${}_l$ in T, respectively. $\sum_{j\in J}a_j\dots$ is as in the conclusion of Lemma 1.3.

Lemma 2.9 implies Lemma 1.3: Firstly, for each $t\in T^\sharp$ we suppose with no loss of generality that ${}_{i_1}$ belongs to T_1 (see the definition above). We then observe that for each $t\in T^\sharp$:

$$Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{a_t}}C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g)-div_{i_1}Xdiv_{i_2}\dots Xdiv_{i_{a_t}}C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g)=\\ \sum_{j\in J}a_jC^j(g),\tag{2.31}$$

modulo complete contractions of length $\ge\sigma+1$.

For each $t\in T^{\sharp\sharp}$ we assume with no loss of generality that ${}_{i_1}$ is the index ${}_j$ or ${}_l$ (see the definition above). Then, for each $t\in T^{\sharp\sharp}$:

$$Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{a_t}}C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g)-div_{i_1}Xdiv_{i_2}\dots Xdiv_{i_{a_t}}C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g)=0,\tag{2.32}$$

modulo complete contractions of length $\ge\sigma+1$.

By the same reasoning we explicitly construct a linear combination of vector fields $\sum_{r\in R}a_rC^{r,i}(g)$ so that:

$$Xdiv_{i_1}Xdiv_{i_2}C^{l,i_1i_2}(g)+\frac{n-4}{n-3}Xdiv_{i_1}C^{l,i_1}(g)+\frac{n-4}{n-3}Xdiv_{i_2}C^{l,i_2}(g)+\\ \frac{(n-4)^2-2(n-4)+2}{(n-3)(n-4)}C^l(g)-div_i\sum_{r\in R}a_rC^{r,i}(g)\\ =\frac{(n-4)(n-3)-2(n-4)^2+(n-4)^2-2(n-4)+2}{(n-3)(n-4)}C^l(g).\tag{2.33}$$

We note that the constant $C=\frac{-n+6}{(n-3)(n-4)}$ on the right hand side is not zero, since for $n=6$ there can not be any complete contraction in the form:

$$contr(\nabla^{(m_1)}W_{ijkl}\otimes\dots\otimes\nabla^{(m_\sigma)}W_{i'j'k'l'})\tag{2.34}$$

with a factor $\nabla^{ik}W_{ijkl}$.

Therefore, if we can prove Lemma 2.9, our Lemma 1.3 will follow.

Proof of Lemma 2.9:

Our proof relies on a careful calculation of $Amb[Xdiv_{i_1}Xdiv_{i_2}C^{l,i_1i_2}(g)]$, based on the algorithm presented in subsection 2.1. We write $Xdiv_{i_1}Xdiv_{i_2}C^{l,i_1i_2}(g)$ out as a sum in the obvious way, $Xdiv_{i_1}Xdiv_{i_2}C^{l,i_1i_2}(g)=\sum_{t=1}^{(\sigma-1)^2}C^t(g)$; then we write:

$$Amb[Xdiv_{i_1}Xdiv_{i_2}C^{l,i_1i_2}(g)]=\sum_{t=1}^{(\sigma-1)^2}\sum_{ass\in ASSIGN^t}\sum_{\gamma\in BR_{ass}}\gamma\{ass\{Amb[C^t(g)]\}\}.\tag{2.35}$$

Now, our Lemma will follow by a careful analysis of the right hand side of the above. To perform this analysis we must divide the right hand side into further sublinear combinations.

We call the factor $W_{i_1 j i_2 l}$ in $C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)$ to which the two free indices belong the *important factor*. For the purposes of the discussion below, each complete contraction $C^t(g)$ above, the indices ${}_{i_1}$, ${}_{i_2}$ in the important factor (which are contracting against $\nabla^{i_1}, \nabla^{i_2}$) will still be called the *free indices*.

Definition 2.8 *Refer to (2.35). Consider any given term $Amb\{C^t(g)\}$. We will write $ASSIGN$ instead of $ASSIGN^t$ for simplicity.*

Define $ASSIGN^- \subset ASSIGN$ to stand for the index set of assignments that assign the values $({}_\infty, {}_0)$ to two particular contractions $({}_a, {}_b), ({}_c, {}_d)$ where ${}_a, {}_c$ belong to different factors.

Define $ASSIGN^1 \subset (ASSIGN \setminus ASSIGN^-)$ to stand for the index set of assignments in $(ASSIGN \setminus ASSIGN^-)$ that assign to at least one particular contraction $({}_a, {}_b)$, where ${}_a$ belongs to the important factor, the values $({}_0, {}_\infty)$.

Define $ASSIGN^\sharp \subset [ASSIGN \setminus (ASSIGN^- \bigcup ASSIGN^1)]$ to stand for the index set of assignments in $(ASSIGN \setminus ASSIGN^-)$ that either do not assign the values $({}_\infty, {}_0)$ to any particular contraction, or do assign such values $({}_\infty, {}_0)$ but subject to the restriction that all the ${}_\infty$'s are assigned to the same factor, which is not the important factor.

Define $ASSIGN^* \subset [ASSIGN \setminus (ASSIGN^- \bigcup ASSIGN^1)]$ to stand for the index set of assignments in $(ASSIGN \setminus ASSIGN^-)$ for which the value ${}_\infty$ is assigned to at least one index, and moreover all the indices ${}_\infty$ are assigned to the important factor, but not to the free indices ${}_{i_1}, {}_{i_2}$.

Define $ASSIGN^+ \subset [ASSIGN \setminus (ASSIGN^- \bigcup ASSIGN^1)]$ to stand for the index set of assignments in $(ASSIGN \setminus ASSIGN^-)$ for which all the values ${}_\infty$ are assigned to indices in the important factor, and at least one of the free indices ${}_{i_1}, {}_{i_2}$ is assigned the value ${}_\infty$.

Let us firstly observe that for each $t, 1 \le t \le (\sigma-1)^2$:

$$ASSIGN = ASSIGN^- \bigcup ASSIGN^1 \bigcup ASSIGN^\sharp \bigcup ASSIGN^* \bigcup ASSIGN^+; \tag{2.36}$$

(in the above $\bigcup$ is a disjoint union). We define:

$$\sum_{ASSIGN^-} ass\{Amb[Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)]\} = \sum_{t=1}^{(\sigma-1)^2} \sum_{ASSIGN^-} ass\{Amb[C^t(g)]\},$$

and also use the same definition for the other subsets of $ASSIGN$.

We will use (2.36), along with (2.35). Before doing so, let us recall a few more facts about the ambient metric:

A key observation is that any tensor in the form $\tilde{\nabla}^{(q)}_{f_1 \dots f_d} \tilde{R}_{zxcv}$ as in (2.7) (i.e. with at least one index have the value ${}_\infty$) can be written out as a linear combination of tensors $\nabla^{(y)} W_{ijkl}(\otimes g \cdots \otimes g)$ *with* an internal contraction in $\nabla^{(y)} W$, modulo quadratic terms in the curvature.[26]

---

[26] Here $(\otimes g \cdots \otimes g)$ means that there may be no such factors.

We only need to be more precise in the case of the factor $T = \tilde{R}_{ijkl}$: If one of the indices ${}_i, {}_j, {}_k, {}_l$ is given the value ${}_0$ then $T = 0$. On the other hand, if $1 \leq {}_j, {}_k, {}_l \leq n$ then $\tilde{R}_{\infty jkl} = -\frac{1}{n-3}\nabla^i W_{ijkl}$. If at least one of the pairs ${}_i, {}_j$ or ${}_k, {}_l$ are both assigned the value ${}_\infty$ then $T = 0$. Finally, if $1 \leq j, l \leq n$ then $\tilde{R}_{\infty j \infty l} = \frac{1}{(n-3)(n-4)}\nabla^{ik} W_{ijkl} + Q(R)$ (see [17, 18]).

We will now calculate $\sum_{ass \in ASSIGN^-} ass[Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)]$, $\dots$, $\sum_{ass \in ASSIGN^+} ass[Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)]$. All equations below hold modulo terms of length $\geq \sigma + 1$.

It immediately follows that:

$$\sum_{ass \in ASSIGN^1} ass[Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)] = 0, \tag{2.37}$$

$$\sum_{ass \in ASSIGN^-} ass[Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)] = \sum_{j \in J} a_j C^j(g). \tag{2.38}$$

We next seek to understand $\sum_{ass \in ASSIGN^\sharp} ass[Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)]$. We claim that:

$$\begin{gathered}\sum_{ass \in ASSIGN^\sharp} ass[Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)] = Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g) + \\ \sum_{t \in T^\sharp} a_t Xdiv_{i_1} \dots Xdiv_{a_t} C^{t,i_1 \dots i_{a_t}}(g) + \sum_{j \in J} a_j C^j(g).\end{gathered} \tag{2.39}$$

Proof of (2.39): Consider the *break-ups* of each different $ass[Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)]$:[27]

$$\begin{gathered}\sum_{ass \in ASSIGN^\sharp} ass[Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)] = \\ \sum_{ass \in ASSIGN^\sharp} \sum_{\gamma \in BR_{ass}} \gamma\{ass[Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)]\}\end{gathered} \tag{2.40}$$

Denote the RHS of the above by Λ. We will break Λ into two sublinear combinations, Λ^1, Λ^2: A term $\gamma\{ass[Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)]\}$ will belong to Λ^1 if it arises by applying one of the rules $\tilde{\nabla}_{i_s} X_j \rightarrow \tilde{\Gamma}^{\infty}_{i_s j} X_\infty = -g_{i_s j} X_\infty$ or $\tilde{\nabla}_{i_s} X_0 \rightarrow \tilde{\Gamma}^k_{i_s 0} X_k = \delta^k_{i_s} X_k$ at least once (as in (2.9)). (Here $\tilde{\nabla}_{i_s}$ stands for a divergence index,[28] which has been assigned a value between ${}_1, \dots, {}_n$, and ${}_j$ is an original index which has been assigned a value ${}_0, \dots, {}_n$). A term $\gamma\{ass[Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)]\}$ belongs to Λ^2 if it arises without applying any of the above two Christoffel symbols.

In the above notation, we will show that:

---

[27] Recall the *break-ups* from subsection 2.1.

[28] This means that the index is not one of the indices in the vector field $Amb[C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)]$ but corresponds to an index from a divergence div_{i_1} or div_{i_2}.

$$\Lambda^1 = 0, \tag{2.41}$$

$$\Lambda^2 = Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g) + \sum_{t \in T^\sharp} a_t Xdiv_{i_1} \dots Xdiv_{a_t} C^{t,i_1 \dots i_{a_t}} + \sum_{j \in J} a_j C^j(g). \tag{2.42}$$

In fact, (2.42) just follows by the definition of Λ^2: If we consider the complete contractions that belong to Λ^2 that arise without assigning any index the value ${}_{\infty}$, it follows that they add up to the term $Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)$; if we consider the complete contractions in Λ^2 that arise by assigning at least one index the value ${}_{\infty}$, it follows that they will add up to a linear combination $\sum_{t \in T^\sharp} a_t Xdiv_{i_1} \dots Xdiv_{a_t} C^{t,i_1 \dots i_{a_t}}(g) + \sum_{j \in J} a_j C^j(g)$.

So, matters are reduced to showing (2.41). We will establish a bijection that will help us prove cancellation in Λ^1.

We arbitrarily pick out one of the free indices ${}_{i_s}$ (so $s = 1$ or $s = 2$). For convenience we just set $s = 1$, but the same claim will be true if we just switch ${}_{i_1}$ and ${}_{i_2}$. We also arbitrarily pick out a particular contraction in the tensor field $C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)$, say $\pi = ({}_a, {}_b)$ where ${}_a$ belongs to the factor T^k and ${}_b$ belongs to the factor T^l and $k, l \neq 1$. We also pick out a factor $T^r, r > 1$ arbitrarily. Then, we consider the complete contraction $C^{l,i_1 i_2|k,r}(g)$ that arises in $Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)$ when ∇^{i_1} hits the k^{th} factor T^k in $C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)$ and ∇^{i_2} hits the r^{th} factor T^r in $C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)$. Accordingly, we consider the complete contraction $C^{l,i_1 i_2|l,r}(g)$ that arises in $Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)$ when ∇^{i_1} hits the l^{th} factor T^l in $C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)$ and ∇^{i_2} hits the r^{th} factor T^r in $C^{l,i_1 i_2}(g)$.

We now consider the ambient analogues $Amb[C^{l,i_1 i_2|k,r}(g)]$, $Amb[C^{l,i_1 i_2|k,r}(g)]$. For $Amb[C^{l,i_1 i_2|l,r}(g)]$ we define $ASSIGN^{\sharp,\pi,A}_{i_1} \subset ASSIGN^\sharp$ to stand for the set of assignments that assign the particular contraction $\pi = ({}_a, {}_b)$ the values $({}_0, {}_\infty)$ and assign the pair $({}_{i_1}, \nabla^{i_1})$ base values (i.e. ${}_{i_1} \in \{{}_1, \dots, {}_n\}$).

On the other hand, for $Amb[C^{l,i_1 i_2|l,r}(g)]$ we define $ASSIGN^{\sharp,\pi,B}_{i_1}$ to stand for the set of assignments where $\pi = ({}_a, {}_b)$ is assigned base values and the pair $({}_{i_1}, \nabla^{i_1})$ is also assigned base values.

Now, for each element $ass \in ASSIGN^{\sharp,\pi,A}_{i_1}$ we define BR^1_{ass} to stand for the set of break-ups that replace the factor $T^k = \tilde{\nabla}^{(m+1)}_{i_s r_1 \dots 0 \dots r_m} \tilde{R}_{ijkl}$ (or analogously when ${}_a = {}_0$ is one of the internal indices) by a factor $-\tilde{\nabla}^{(m)}_{r_1 \dots i_1 \dots r_m} \tilde{R}_{ijkl}$ (i.e. we apply $\tilde{\Gamma}^k_{i_s 0} = \delta^k_{i_s}$ to the indices $\tilde{\nabla}_{i_s}, \tilde{\nabla}_0$, as in (2.9)). For $C^{l,i_1 i_2|l,r}(\tilde{g}^{n+2})$ and each element $ass \in ASSIGN^{\sharp,\pi,B}_{i_1}$, we define BR^2_{ass} to stand for the set of break-ups that replace the factor $T^l = \tilde{\nabla}^{(m'+1)}_{i_s r'_1 \dots b \dots r_{m'}} \tilde{R}_{i'j'k'l'}$ (or analogously where b is one of the internal indices) by a factor $\tilde{\nabla}^{(m')}_{r'_1 \dots \infty \dots r'_m} \tilde{R}_{i'j'k'l'} g_{i_1 b}$ (i.e. we apply $\tilde{\Gamma}^{\infty}_{i_s b} = -g_{i_s b}$.

We then observe that in the above notation, for each $\pi \in \Pi$, each $r = 2, \dots, \sigma$:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{ass\in ASSIGN^{\sharp,\pi,A}_{i_s}}\sum_{\gamma\in BR^1_{ass}}\gamma\{ass[Amb[C^{l,i_1i_2|k,r}(g)]]\}\\&+\sum_{ass\in ASSIGN^{\sharp,\pi,B}_{i_s}}\sum_{\gamma\in BR^2_{ass}}\gamma\{[Amb[C^{l,i_1i_2|l,r}(g)]]\}=0.\end{aligned}\tag{2.43}$$

In view of the above cancellation, when analyzing Λ^1 we may *discard* any contraction that involves using the symbol $\tilde{\Gamma}^{\infty}_{ij}$ to a pair $\tilde{\nabla}_{i_s}X_k$ (where ${}_{i_s}$ is a divergence index and X_k is not contracting against the important factor). We may also discard any complete contraction that arises when we use the symbol $\tilde{\Gamma}^k_{i_s0}$ to a pair $\tilde{\nabla}_{i_s}X_d$ where X_d is an original index in $C^{l,i_1i_2}(g)$ that is not contracting the important factor.

So, to show (2.41), we only have to consider the terms in the LHS that arise by using one of the symbols $\tilde{\Gamma}^{\infty}_{i_sj}$, $\tilde{\Gamma}^k_{i_s0}$ to a pair $\tilde{\nabla}_{i_s}X_v$ where ${}_{i_s}$ is a divergence index and X_v *is* contracting against the important factor (and where in addition ${}_v$ has been assigned a value ${}_0,\dots,{}_n$).

Now, observe that there can be no contractions arising from an assignment $ass\in ASSIGN^{\sharp}$ with an index ${}_v$ having been assigned the value ${}_0$, and the same index ${}_v$ contracting against an index ${}_b$ in the important factor in $C^{l,i_1i_2}(g)$: In that case, the index ${}_b$ would have been assigned a value ${}_\infty$, which contradicts the fact that $ass\in ASSIGN^{\sharp}$.

So we only need to observe that we may discard any complete contraction that arises when we use the symbol $\tilde{\Gamma}^{\infty}_{i_sk}$ to a pair of indices $(\tilde{\nabla}_{i_s},{}_k)$ where $\tilde{\nabla}_{i_s}$ is the divergence index and ${}_k$ is contracting against an index in the important factor-this follows because $\tilde{\Gamma}^{\infty}_{i_sk}=-g_{i_sk}$ and the Weyl tensor is trace-free. This proves our claim. $\Box$

Next, we wish to analyze

$$\sum_{ass\in ASSIGN^*}\sum_{\gamma\in BR_{ass}}\gamma\{ass[Xdiv_{i_1}Xdiv_{i_2}C^{l,i_1i_2}(g)]\}.$$

Using the definition of $ASSIGN^*$ and the Christoffel symbols for $\tilde{g}$, we observe that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{ass\in ASSIGN^*}\sum_{\gamma\in BR_{ass}}\gamma\{assAmb[Xdiv_{i_1}Xdiv_{i_2}C^{l,i_1i_2}(g)]\}=\\&-\frac{1}{n-3}Xdiv_{i_1}C^{l,i_1}(g)-\frac{1}{n-3}Xdiv_{i_2}C^{l,i_2}(g)\\&+\frac{2}{(n-3)(n-4)}C^l(g)+\sum_{t\in T^{\sharp}}b_tXdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{a_t}}C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g)\\&+\sum_{t\in T^{\sharp\sharp}}b_tXdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{a_t}}C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g)+\sum_{j\in J}a_jC^j(g).\end{aligned}\tag{2.44}$$

Note: The first three terms in the RHS arise by applying the Christoffel symbol $\tilde{\Gamma}^k_{i_s0} = \delta^k_{i_s}$ at least once (we also use the first Bianchi identity here–the details are left to the reader).[29] It is easy to observe that the sublinear combination that arises when the symbol $\tilde{\Gamma}^k_{i_s0} = \delta^k_{i_s}$ is never applied will equal $\sum_{t\in T^{\sharp\sharp}} \dots$.

Finally, we must understand the sublinear combination

$$\sum_{ass\in ASSIGN^+} \sum_{\gamma\in BR_{ass}} \gamma\{ass[Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1i_2}(\tilde{g}^{n+2})]\}.$$

We calculate that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{ass\in ASSIGN^+} assAmb[Xdiv_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_1i_2}(g)] = \frac{(n-4)^2}{(n-3)(n-4)} C^l(g) \\
&+ Xdiv_{i_1} C^{l,i_1}(g) + Xdiv_{i_2} C^{l,i_2}(g) - \frac{2}{(n-3)} C^l(g) \\
&+ \sum_{t\in T^{\sharp\sharp}} a_t Xdiv_{i_1} \dots Xdiv_{i_{a_t}} C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g) + \sum_{j\in J} a_j C^j(g).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.45}$$

Note again, the first four terms in the RHS arise by applying the Christoffel symbol $\tilde{\Gamma}^k_{i_s0} = \delta^k_{i_s}$ at least once (we also again use the first Bianchi identity).

Thus, in view of (2.35), (2.36), by just adding up the equations (2.37), (2.38), (2.39), (2.44), (2.45) we derive Lemma 1.3. □

Proof of Lemma 2.3:

Now, to show Lemma 2.3, we recall the notational conventions from the statement of the Lemma and introduce some additionnal ones:[30] Recall that $\sum_{f\in F} a_f C^f(g)$ stands for a generic linear combination of complete contractions in the form (1.2) with $\delta_W \geq 2$. Also, $\sum_{t\in T^\sharp} a_t C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g)$ will now stand for a generic linear combination of tensor fields in the form (1.2) with $a_t > 0$ (i.e. with at least one free index) and with one internal contraction. All equations in this proof will hold modulo complete contractions of length $\geq \sigma + 1$.

Now, for each $C^v(g)$ as in the statement of Lemma 2.3 we consider $\nabla_i C^v(g)$ (which is thought of as the sum of σ partial contractions). Then, for each $v \in V$ we consider the linear combination $Xdiv_i[\nabla_i C^v(g)]$ and we construct its *ambient analogue* (see the Definition 2.2):

$$Amb\{Xdiv_i[\nabla_i C^v(g)]\}.$$

We then claim:

Lemma 2.10 *For each $v \in V$:*

---

[29] Here ${}_{i_s}$ comes from an index $\tilde{\nabla}_{i_s}$, from one of the divergences div_{i_1}, div_{i_2}.

[30] The reader should note that the notational conventions here are different from the ones in the proof of the previous Lemma.

$$
\begin{aligned}
&Amb\{Xdiv_i[\nabla_i C^v(g)]\} = 2\Delta_r C^v(g) + Xdiv_i[\nabla_i C^v(g)] + \sum_{f\in F} a_f C^f(g)\\
&+\sum_{t\in T^\sharp} a_t Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{a_t}} C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g),
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.46}
$$

modulo complete contractions of length $\geq \sigma+1$.

We observe that if we can prove the above, then Lemma 2.3 follows from two easy observations: Firstly:

$$Xdiv_i[\nabla_i C^v(g)] - div_i[\nabla_i C^v(g)] = -\Delta_r C^v(g).$$

Secondly, for every $t\in T^\sharp$:

$$Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{a_t}} C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g) - div_{i_1} Xdiv_{i_2}\dots Xdiv_{i_{a_t}} C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g) = \sum_{f\in F} a_f C^f(g).$$

Thus, it suffices to show Lemma 2.10.

Proof of Lemma 2.10: Firstly, we will number the factors in $C^v(g)$ and denote them by $F_1,\dots,F_\sigma$. Then, we will denote by $\nabla^\tau_i C^v(g)$ the vector field that arises from $C^v(g)$ by replacing the factor F_τ by $\nabla_i F_\tau$. We also denote by m_τ the number of derivatives in the factor $F_\tau = \nabla^{(m_\tau)} W_{ijkl}$.

We will then show that for any τ, $1\leq\tau\leq\sigma$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&Amb\{Xdiv_i[\nabla^\tau_i C^v(g)]\} = \Delta^\tau_r C^v(g) + Xdiv_i[\nabla^\tau_i C^v(g)] + \frac{m_\tau+2}{n-2}\Delta_r C^v(g)\\
&+\sum_{f\in F} a_f C^f(g) + \sum_{t\in T^\sharp} a_t Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{a_t}} C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g).
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.47}
$$

In view of the equation $\sum_{\tau=1}^{\sigma}(m_\tau+2) = n-2$, (2.47) implies Lemma 2.10.

Proof of (2.47): We will show this equation using the notions of *assignment* and *break-ups* from subsection 2.1.

We recall the following fact regarding the ambient metric: Consider any tensor $T = \tilde{\nabla}^{(m)}_{\infty r_2\dots r_m}\tilde{R}_{ijkl}$, where all the indices ${}_{r_2},\dots,{}_{r_m},{}_i,{}_j,{}_k,{}_l$ have values between ${}_1$ and ${}_n$. It then follows from the formula $\partial_\infty \tilde{g}_{ab} = 2P_{ab}$ in [18] that:

$$T = -\frac{1}{n-2}\Delta\nabla^{(m-1)}_{r_2\dots r_m} W_{ijkl} + \sum_{h\in H} a_h [T^h(g)(\otimes g\cdots\otimes g)]_{r_2\dots r_m ijkl} + Q(R), \tag{2.48}$$

where each tensor $T^h(g)$ is in the form $\nabla^{(m')}W_{ijkl}$ with at least *two* internal contractions.

Furthermore, it can be seen from [17], [18] that any component $T' = \tilde{\nabla}^{(m)}_{r_1 \dots r_m} \tilde{R}_{ijkl}$ where at least *two* of the indices $_{r_1}, \dots, _{l}$ having the value $_{\infty}$ can be expressed as:

$$T' = \sum_{h \in H} a_h [T^h(g)(\otimes g \cdots \otimes g)]_{r_2 \dots r_m ijkl} + Q(R), \tag{2.49}$$

with the same conventions as above.

Now, for the purposes of the next definition we write out $Amb\{Xdiv_i[\nabla^{\tau}_i C^v(g)]\} = \sum_{t=1}^{\sigma-1} Amb[C^t(g)]$. We prove our Lemma by examining the right hand side of the equation:

$$Amb\{Xdiv_i[\nabla^{\tau}_i C^v(g)]\} = \sum_{t=1}^{\sigma-1} \sum_{ass \in ASSIGN^t} \sum_{\gamma \in BR_{ass}} \gamma\{ass[Amb[C^t(g)]]\}. \tag{2.50}$$

It will again be useful to break the right hand side of the above into sublinear combinations. We will now call the factor F_{τ} (to which ∇_i belongs) the *important factor*. We will also call the index ∇_i in that factor the "free index".

Definition 2.9 *Refer to (2.50). Consider any fixed* $Amb[C^t(g)]$. *We write* $ASSIGN$ *instead of* $ASSIGN^t$ *for simplicity.*

We define $ASSIGN^- \subset ASSIGN$ *to stand for the index set of assignments where at least two different indices in* $Amb[C^t(g)]$ *are assigned the value* $_{\infty}$.

We define $ASSIGN^{\sharp} \subset (ASSIGN \setminus ASSIGN^-)$ *to stand for the index set of assignments where the pair of values* $(_{\infty}, _0)$ *is assigned to at most one particular contraction, and moreover if such a pair is assigned to a particular contraction* $(_a, _b)$ *then neither* $_a$ *nor* $_b$ *belongs to the important factor.*

We define $ASSIGN^1 \subset (ASSIGN \setminus ASSIGN^-)$ *to stand for the set of assignments in* $(ASSIGN \setminus ASSIGN^-)$ *that assign the pair of values* $(_0, _{\infty})$ *to exactly one particular contraction* $(_a, _b)$ *where in addition* $_a$ *belongs to the important factor.*

We define $ASSIGN^* \subset (ASSIGN \setminus ASSIGN^-)$ *to stand for the set of assignments in* $(ASSIGN \setminus ASSIGN^-)$ *that assign the values* $(_{\infty}, _0)$ *to exactly one particular contraction* $(_a, _b)$ *where in addition* $_a$ *belongs to the important factor and is not the free index* ∇_i.

We define $ASSIGN^+ \subset (ASSIGN \setminus ASSIGN^-)$ *to stand for the assignment in* $(ASSIGN \setminus ASSIGN^-)$ *that assigns the value* $_{\infty}$ *to the free index* ∇_i, *(and the value* $_0$ *to the index against which it contracts) and does not assign this value to any other index.*

Clearly:

$$ASSIGN = ASSIGN^- \bigcup ASSIGN^{\sharp} \bigcup ASSIGN^1 \bigcup ASSIGN^* \bigcup ASSIGN^+; \tag{2.51}$$

(where in the above $\bigcup$ stands for a disjoint union).

Firstly, by virtue of (2.48), (2.49) we observe that:

$$\sum_{ass\in ASSIGN^-} ass[Amb[Xdiv_i[\nabla^\tau_i C^v(g)]]] = \sum_{f\in F} a_f C^f(g). \tag{2.52}$$

By repeating the cancellation argument from equation (2.41) we derive that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{ass\in ASSIGN^\sharp} ass\{Amb[Xdiv_i[\nabla^\tau_i C^v(g)]]\} = Xdiv_i[\nabla^\tau_i C^v(g)] + \frac{m_\tau+2}{n-2}\Delta^\tau_r C^v(g)\\ &+\sum_{t\in T^\sharp} a_t Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{b_t} C^{t,i_1\dots i_{b_t}}(g) + \sum_{f\in F} a_f C^f(g).\end{aligned} \tag{2.53}$$

Note: The expression $\frac{m_\tau+2}{n-2}\Delta^\tau_r C^v(g)$ arises from the assignments where no index is assigned a value $_\infty$, by applying $\tilde{\Gamma}^\infty_{ia} = -g_{ia}$ to the pairs of indices $_i, _a$ ($_i$ is the free index) in the important factor.

Now, by virtoe of the Christoffel symbol $\tilde{\Gamma}^k_{0i} = \delta^k_i$, we straightforwardly derive:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{ass\in ASSIGN^1} ass[Amb[Xdiv_i[\nabla^\tau_i C^v(g)]]] =\\ &\frac{m_\tau+2}{n-2}\sum_{k=1,k\neq\tau}^{\sigma}\Delta^k_r[C^v(g)] + \sum_{t\in T^\sharp} a_t Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{a_t}} C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g) + \sum_{f\in F} a_f C^f(g).\end{aligned} \tag{2.54}$$

Furthermore, we derive:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{ass\in ASSIGN^*} ass\{Amb[Xdiv_i[\nabla^\tau_i C^v(g)]]\} =\\ &\frac{m_\tau+2}{n-2}\Delta^\tau_r C^v(g) + \sum_{t\in T^\sharp} a_t Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{a_t}} C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g) + \sum_{f\in F} a_f C^f(g).\end{aligned} \tag{2.55}$$

Note: The sublinear combination $\frac{m_\tau+2}{n-2}\Delta^\tau_r C^v(g)$ arises as follows: Recall that $ass \in ASSIGN^*$ assigns one pair of values $(_\infty, _0)$ to any particular contraction $(_a, _b)$ where $_a$ belongs to the important factor and $_a$ is *not* the free index $_i$. The coefficient then arises when we use the Christoffel symbol $\tilde{\Gamma}^k_{i0} = \delta^k_i$ to the pair $\tilde{\nabla}_i X_b$ (where X_b stands for the index that is contracting against the index $_a$ in the important factor-hence $_b$ has been assigned the value $_0$). The second Bianchi identity is also employed here.

Finally we calculate:

$$\sum_{ass\in ASSIGN^+} ass[AmbXdiv_i[\nabla^\tau_i C^v(g)] = \frac{n-2-(m_\tau+2)}{n-2}\Delta^\tau_r C^v(g)+ \\ \sum_{t\in T^\sharp} a_t Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{a_t}} C^{t,i_1\dots i_{a_t}}(g) + \sum_{f\in F} a_f C^f(g). \tag{2.56}$$

$\frac{n-2-(m_\tau+2)}{n-2}\Delta^\tau_r C^v(g)$ arises by assigning the pair $({}_\infty, {}_0)$ to the divergence pair $({}_i, \nabla^i)$. The coefficient $\frac{n-2-(m_\tau+2)}{n-2}$ arises by virtue of the formula $\tilde{\Gamma}^k_{i0}$ applied to any pair $(\tilde{\nabla}_i, X_k)$.(Recall that there the diregence index $\tilde{\nabla}_i$ is assigned the value ${}_0$).

Plugging the equations (2.52)–(2.56) into (2.50) we obtain our Lemma 2.3. □

3 Proof of Lemma 1.4: The divergence "piece" in $P(g)$.

The aim of this section is to prove that when $P(g)$ is as in the hypothesis of Lemma 1.4, then the sublinear combination $\sum_{l\in L^j} a_l C^l(g)$ in $P(g)$[31] can be cancelled out (modulo introducing new "better" terms as in the statement of Lemma 1.4) by subtracting a divergence of a vector field, as allowed by the Deser-Schwimmer conjecture.

Again, we rely on the only tool we have at our disposal, which allows us to pass from the invariance under integration enjoyed by $P(g)$ to a *local equation*: We consider the linear operator $I^1_g(\phi) := [\frac{d}{dt}|_{t=0}[e^{nt\phi}P(e^{2t\phi}g)]$, for which $\int_{M^n} I^1_g(\phi)dV_g = 0$. The aim is to invoke the super divergence formula for $I^1_g(\phi)$,[32] to derive the claim in the previous paragraph. The are two challenges one must address: Firstly, how can one recover $\sum_{l\in L^j} a_l C^l(g)$ by examining $I^1_g(\phi)$? Secondly, how can one use the super divergence formula for $I^1_g(\phi)$ to derive the claim on $\sum_{l\in L^j} a_l C^l(g)$?

The first challenge is not hard; it follows by studying the transformation law of covariant derivatives of the Weyl curvature, paying special attention to *internal contractions*.[33] This is carried out in subsection 3.1. The second challenge is not straightforward; one difficulty, already discussed in [3], is again that a direct application of the super divergence formula to $I^1_g(\phi)$ *does not* imply Lemma 1.4. For that reason, we must formulate certain "main algebraic propositions", see Propositions 3.1 and 3.2 in subsection 3.2 below, which will allow us to derive Lemma 1.4 from the super divergence formula applied to $I^1_g(\phi)$. These propositions can be viewed as analogues of the "main algebraic

---

[31] Recall that $\sum_{l\in L^j} a_l C^l(g)$ stands for the sublinear combination of terms with length σ and j internal contractions; recall that $j \geq 2$ and all other terms of length σ in $P(g)$ are assumed to be in the form (1.2) with at least $j+1$ internal contractions.

[32] Which expresses $I^1_g(\phi)$ as a divergence, $I^1_g(\phi) = div_i T^i_g(\phi)$

[33] See the definition above Proposition 1.1.

Proposition" in subsection 5.3 [3]; all three of these algebraic propositions will be proven in the series of papers [6, 7, 8].

However, there is an additional important challenge in this case, briefly discussed at the end of subsection 1.1: In a nutshell, the problem concerns a certain "loss of information" which occurs when we pass from $I^1_g(\phi)$ (which satisfies the integral equation $\int_{M^n} I^1_g(\phi)dV_g = 0$) to the super divergence formula applied to $I^1_g(\phi)$, $supdiv[I^1_g(\phi)] = 0$. As explained at the end of subsection 1.1, upon examining the terms with $\sigma + 1$ factors in $I^1_g(\phi)$ which also have a factor $\nabla\phi$,[34] we can *recover* the sublinear combination $\sum_{l\in L^j} a_l C^l(g)$ in $P(g)$. However, when we examine the terms of length $\sigma + 1$ in $supdiv[I^1_g(\phi)] = 0$ with a factor $\nabla\phi$, we find that those terms arise *both* from the sublinear combination $(I^1_g(\phi))_{\nabla\phi}$ but *also* from the sublinear combination of terms $\sum_{q\in Q} a_q C^q(g)\cdot\Delta\phi$ in (1.8) (which contain a factor $\Delta\phi$; this factor gives rise to a factor $\nabla\phi$ in the super divergence formula, due to integrations by parts). Therefore the additional challenge in this case is that we must somehow "get rid" of the potentialy harmful terms in $\sum_{q\in Q} a_q C^q(g)\cdot\Delta(\phi)$; we note that apriori we have *no* information on this sublinear combination. We achieve this goal by virtue of the fact that the terms in $\sum_{l\in L^j} a_l C^l(g)$ in the hypothesis of Lemma 1.4) have at least two internal contractions belonging to *different factors*.[35] Using this fact, we are able to use the super divergence formula $supdiv[I^1_g(\phi)] = 0$ (and the "main algebraic propositions") in two different ways, in order to first "get rid" of the potentially harmful terms in $\sum_{q\in Q} a_q C^q(g)\cdot\Delta(\phi)$ and *then* to derive Lemma 1.4.

3.1 Preliminary work: How can one recover $P(g)$ from $I^1_g(\phi)$?

As preliminary work for this section, we will study the images $Image^1_\phi[C(g)]$ of complete contractions $C(g)$ in the form (1.2) with weight $-n$ and length σ.[36]

In order to do this, we will study the transformation laws of tensors $T = \nabla^{r_{a_1}\dots r_{a_s}}\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m} W_{r_{m+1}r_{m+2}r_{m+3}r_{m+4}}$, where each of the indices ${}^{r_{a_x}}$ is contracting against an index ${}_{r_{a_x}}$ and all the other indices in $T_h(g)$ are free. For each such tensor $T_h(g)$, we define $Image^1_\phi[T_h]$ to stand for the sublinear combination in

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda}|_{\lambda=0} T_h(e^{2\lambda\phi}g)$$

that involves factors $\nabla^{(p)}\phi$ with $p > 0$ (i.e. we are excluding the partial contractions with a factor ϕ, without derivatives).

Clearly, for each complete contraction $C(g)$ in the form (1.2):

---

[34] In 1.1 we denoted the sublinear combination of those terms by $(I^1_g(\phi))_{\nabla\phi}$–see (1.8).

[35] Recall that we were able to reduce ourselves to this setting by virtue of our elaborate constructions in the ambient metric in the previous section.

[36] Recall that $Image^1_\phi[C(g)] = \frac{d}{dt}|_{t=0}[e^{nt\phi}C^{2t\phi}g)]$.

$$Image^1_\phi[C(g)] = \sum_{h=1}^{\sigma} C^{sub(T_h)}(g), \tag{3.1}$$

where $C^{sub(T_h)}(g)$ stands for the complete contraction that arises from $C(g)$ by replacing the factor T_h by $Image^1_\phi[T_h]$ and then contracting indices according to the same pattern as for $C(g)$.

Transformation laws: Recall that the Weyl tensor is conformally invariant, i.e. $W_{ijkl}(e^{2\phi}g)e^{2\phi}W_{ijkl}(g)$. Recall also the transformation law of the Levi-Civita connection:

$$\nabla_k\eta_l(e^{2\phi}g) = \nabla_k\eta_l(g) - \nabla_k\phi\eta_l - \nabla_l\phi\eta_k + \nabla^s\phi\eta_s g_{kl}. \tag{3.2}$$

Now, in order to perform our calculations, we will have to introduce some notational conventions. For the purposes of this subsection, when we write $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}, \nabla^{(m)}Ric$ or $\nabla^{(m)}R$ (R is the scalar curvature) we will mean a tensor in those forms, possibly with some internal contractions. Also as usual, whenever we write $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$ we will mean that no two of the indices ${}_{i,j,k,l}$ are contracting between themselves and, when we write $\nabla^{(p)}Ric_{ij}$ we will mean that no two of the indices ${}_{i,j}$ are contracting between themselves.

Notation: We will denote by $T^\alpha(\phi)$ a partial contraction of the form

$$\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}R_{r_{m+1}r_{m+2}r_{m+3}r_{m+4}}\nabla^{r_a}\phi, \tag{3.3}$$

where the factor $\nabla\phi$ is contracting against one of the indices ${}_{r_1,\dots,r_{m+4}}$ in the first factor. $T^\beta(\phi)$ will stand for a partial contraction in the form:

$$\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}R_{ijkl}\Delta\phi. \tag{3.4}$$

$T^\gamma(\phi)$ will stand for a partial contraction in the form:

$$\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}R_{ijkl}\nabla_x\phi, \tag{3.5}$$

where ${}_x$ is a free index. $T^\delta(\phi)$ will stand for a partial contraction in the form:

$$\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}R_{ijkl}\nabla^{(2)}_{yx}\phi, \tag{3.6}$$

where both ${}_y$ and ${}_x$ are free indices; finally, $T^\epsilon(\phi)$ will be a generic tensor product in the form:

$$\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}R_{ijkl}\nabla^{(p)}_{s_1\dots s_p}\phi \tag{3.7}$$

where either $p \geq 3$ or $p = 2$ and at least one of the indices ${}_{s_1,s_2}$ is contracting against the factor $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$.

We also generically denote by $T^\alpha_{Ric}(\phi), T^\beta_{Ric}(\phi), T^\gamma_{Ric}(\phi)$, $T^\delta_{Ric}(\phi)$, $T^\epsilon_{Ric}(\phi)$, $T^\zeta_{Ric}(\phi)$ tensor fields that are as above, but only with the factor $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$ formally replaced by an expression $\nabla^{(m)}[Ric\otimes g]_{ijkl}$ (the indices ${}_{i,j,k,l}$ belonging to the factors Ric, g). We also denote by $T^\alpha_R(\phi), T^\beta_R(\phi), T^\gamma_R(\phi)$, $T^\delta_R(\phi)$, $T^\epsilon_R(\phi)$,

$T^\zeta_R(\phi)$ tensor fields that are as above, but only with the factor $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$ replaced by an expression $\nabla^{(m)}R\otimes[g\otimes g]_{ijkl}$.

Now, for each factor in one of the 15 forms above, we will denote by δ the total number of internal contractions in the curvature term (i.e. in the factors $Ric_{ab}=R^k{}_{akb}$ and $R=R^{ab}{}_{ab}$ we *also count* the internal contractions in R itself)–notice that in our definition any internal contractions in the factor $\nabla^{(p)}\phi$ do *not* count towards δ. We will then denote by $\sum_{\delta\ge t}T$ a *generic* linear combination of tensor fields in any of the forms above other than (3.7) (and its analogues when we replace $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$ by $\nabla^{(m)}Ric\otimes g$ or $\nabla^{(m)}R\otimes g$), with at least t internal contractions in the curvature factor. We will also denote by $\sum_{irrelevant}T$ a generic linear combination of tensor fields in the form (3.7) or its analogues when we replace $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$ by $\nabla^{(m)}Ric\otimes g$ or $\nabla^{(m)}R\otimes g\otimes g$.

We will first use the notation above in studying the transformation law of normalized factors $\nabla^{r_{a_1}\dots r_{a_t}}\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}W_{ijkl}$, where each of the upper indices ${}^{r_{a_h}}$ contracts against a lower derivative index ${}_{r_{a_h}}$.[37] Using the transformation law for the Weyl curvature and the Levi-Civita connection (see the subsection 2.3 in [3]), we calculate that modulo partial contractions of length ≥ 3:

$$Image^1_\phi[\nabla^{r_{a_1}\dots r_{a_t}}\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}W_{ijkl}]=(t\cdot(n-2)-4\binom{t}{2})\nabla^{a_2\dots a_t}\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}R_{ijkl}\nabla^{a_1}\phi$$
$$+\sum_{\delta=t-1,\Delta}T+\sum_{\delta\ge t}T+\sum_{irrelevant}T. \tag{3.8}$$

The sublinear combination $\sum_{\delta=t-1,\Delta}T$ stands for a generic linear combination of partial contractions in the form (3.4) with $t-1$ internal contractions.

We now consider a factor $T=\nabla^{r_{a_1}\dots r_{a_t}}\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}W_{r_{m+1}r_{m+2}r_{m+3}r_{m+4}}$ where exactly one of the indices ${}^{r_{a_1}},\dots,{}^{r_{a_t}}$ is contracting against one of the internal indices in the factor $W_{r_{m+1}r_{m+2}r_{m+3}r_{m+4}}$. With no loss of generality we assume the index ${}^{r_{a_1}}$ is contracting against the index ${}_i={}_{r_{m+1}}$, and we write the factor T in the form:

$$T=\nabla^{ir_{a_2}\dots r_{a_t}}\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}W_{ijkl}.$$

In that case we apply the transformation law of the Weyl curvature and the Leci-Civita connection to derive that:

$$\begin{aligned}&Image^1_\phi[\nabla^{ir_{a_2}\dots r_{a_t}}\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}W_{ijkl}]=(n-3)\nabla^{r_{a_2}\dots r_{a_t}}\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}R_{ijkl}\nabla^i\phi\\&+[(t-1)(n-3)-4\binom{t}{2}\frac{n-3}{n-2}]\nabla^{ir_{a_3}\dots r_{a_t}}\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}R_{ijkl}\nabla^{r_{a_2}}\phi+\\&\sum_{\delta=t-1,negligible}T+\sum_{\delta=t-1,\Delta}T+\sum_{\delta\ge t}T+\sum_{irrelevant}T,\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

---

[37] Thus the above factor has t internal contractions in total.

where the sublinear combination $\sum_{\delta=t-1,negligible} T$ stands for a generic linear combination of contractions in the form $\nabla^{ir_{a_3}\dots r_{a_t}}\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}R_{ijkl}\nabla^j\phi$ with $t-1$ internal contractions (notice that $\nabla\phi$ is contracting against the index ${}_j$ and the index ${}_i$ is also involved in an internal contraction). The sublinear combination $\sum_{\delta=t-1,\Delta} T$ stands for a generic linear combination of partial contractions in the form (3.4) with $t-1$ internal contractions.

Finally, we consider the transformation law of factors $T = \nabla^{r_{a_1}\dots r_{a_t}}\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}W_{r_{m+1}r_{m+2}r_{m+3}r_{m+4}}$ where more than one of the indices ${}^{r_{a_1}},\dots,{}^{r_{a_t}}$ is contracting against one of the internal indices in $W_{r_{m+1}r_{m+2}r_{m+3}r_{m+4}}$. In view of the anti-symmetry of the indices ${}_i, {}_j$ and ${}_k, {}_l$, we may assume that there are exactly two of the indices ${}^{r_{a_x}}$ contracting against internal indices in the factor W_{ijkl} (modulo introducing quadratic correction terms); moreover (for the same reasons), we may assume with no loss of generality that the indices ${}^{r_{a_1}}, {}^{r_{a_2}}$ are contracting against the indices ${}_i, {}_k$ and also that the tensor T is symmetric with respect to the indices ${}_j, {}_l$ (this is because of the first Bianchi and the antisymmetry of ${}_i, {}_j$). Thus in this setting we write the factor T in the form:

$$T = \nabla^{ikr_{a_3}\dots r_{a_t}}\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}W_{ijkl}.$$

We then calculate:

$$\begin{aligned}
&Image^1_\phi[\nabla^{ikr_{a_3}\dots r_{a_t}}\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}W_{ijkl}] = (n-4)(\frac{n-3}{n-2})\nabla^{kr_{a_3}\dots r_{a_t}}\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}R_{ijkl}\nabla^i\phi \\
&+ (n-4)(\frac{n-3}{n-2})\nabla^{ir_{a_3}\dots r_{a_t}}\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}R_{ijkl}\nabla^k\phi \\
&+ (t-2)(n-3)\nabla^{ikr_{a_4}\dots r_{a_t}}\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}R_{ijkl}\nabla^{r_{a_3}}\phi \\
&- 4(\frac{n-3}{n-2})(\binom{\delta-2}{2} + 2\binom{\delta-1}{2})\nabla^{ikr_{a_4}\dots r_{a_t}}\nabla^{(m)}_{r_1\dots r_m}R_{ijkl}\nabla^{r_{a_3}}\phi \\
&+ \sum_{\delta=t-1,\Delta} T + \sum_{\delta=t-1,negligible} T + \sum_{\delta=t-1,*} T + \sum_{\delta\geq t} T + \sum_{irrelevant} T.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Here $\sum_{\delta=t-1,*} T$ stands for a generic linear combination of contractions in the form $\nabla^{s_a}\phi\nabla^{(m+t+1)}_{s_1\dots s_{m+t+1}}R$ where $\nabla^{(m+t+1)}_{s_1\dots s_{m+t+1}}R$ is a factor of the scalar curvature, the factor $\nabla^{s_a}\phi$ contracts against that factor and the total number of internal contractions in this term[38] is $\delta-1$. The other linear combinations in the last line of (3.10) follow the same notational conventions as for the RHS of (3.9)).

Let us finally recall from the subsection “Technical tools” in [3] the formulas concerning the decomposition of iterated covariant derivatives of the Weyl tensor.

We make two notes regarding (3.8) and (3.9): Firstly the coefficients $(t\cdot(n-2)-4\binom{t}{2})$, $(n-3)$, etc. are independent of m. Secondly, since $n>4$ they are nonzero: this is clear because by the weight restriction we must have $t\leq\frac{n-4}{2}$.

These identities will be used later on in this section.

---

[38] Including the two in $R = R^{ab}{}_{ab}$ itself.

3.2 The main algebraic Propositions.

Propositions 3.1 and 3.2 are the main tools we will need for this section. (As explained in the introduction, these two Propositions, together with the main algebraic Proposition 5.1 in [3] will be proven in the series of papers [6, 7, 8]). We will be considering tensor fields $C^{i_1\dots i_\alpha}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)$ of length $\sigma+1$ (with no internal contractions) in the form:

$$pcontr(\nabla^{(m_1)}R_{ijkl}\otimes\dots\otimes\nabla^{(m_s)}R_{ijkl}\otimes\nabla^{(b_1)}\Omega_1\otimes\dots\otimes\nabla^{(b_p)}\Omega_p\otimes\nabla\phi). \quad (3.11)$$

Here $\sigma=s+p$ and ${}_{i_1},\dots,{}_{i_\alpha}$ are the free indices.

Definition 3.1 *A complete or partial contraction in the form (3.11) will be called acceptable if the following conditions hold:*

1. *Each $b_i\ge 2$, (in other forms each function Ω_h is differentiated at least twice).*
2. *No factors have internal contractions.*[39]
3. *The factor $\nabla\phi$ is contracting against some other factor (in other words the index ${}_a$ in $\nabla_a\phi$ is not a free index).*

The above definition (and also a generalized version of it) will be used very often both in this paper and in the following ones. For the purposes of the next Proposition we will introduce two more definitions which will be used only in the present paper. (For the reader's convenience we specify that the notion of *type* that we introduce below is a special case of the notion of *weak character* which we introduce in the paper [6]).

Definition 3.2 *A complete or partial contraction in the form (3.11) will have type A if the factor $\nabla\phi$ is contracting against a factor $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$. It will have type B if the factor $\nabla\phi$ is contracting against a factor $\nabla^{(B)}\Omega_h$.*

We will divide the type A contractions into two subcategories: We will say a (complete or partial) contraction has type A1 if the factor $\nabla\phi$ is contracting against an internal index in a factor $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$,[40] *has type A2 if it is contracting against a derivative index.*

We will also say that a (complete or partial) contraction of type A1 has a removable index if $\sum m_i+\sum b_i>2p$ in the notation of (3.11).

Given an acceptable partial contraction with $\sigma+1$ factors and a free indices, $C^{i_1\dots i_a}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)$ in the form (3.11) and any of its free indices ${}_{i_s}$, we recall that $div_{i_s}C^{i_1\dots i_a}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)$ can be written as a sum of $\sigma+1$ partial contractions with $(a-1)$ free indices each; the t^{th} summand corresponds to the $(a-1)$-partial contraction that arises when the derivative ∇^{i_s} hits the t^{th} factor.

---

[39] I.e. no two indices in the same factor contract against each other.

[40] (In other words, against one of the indices ${}_i,{}_j,{}_k,{}_l$.)

Definition 3.3 *Given $C^{i_1\dots i_a}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)$ a partial contraction in the form (3.11) as above, we define $Xdiv_{i_s}C^{i_1\dots i_a}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)$ to stand for the sublinear combination in $div_{i_s}C^{i_1\dots i_a}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)$ which arises when the derivative ∇^{i_s} is not allowed to hit the factor $\nabla\phi$, nor the factor to which the index $_{i_s}$ belongs.*

Before stating our Proposition we make two notes regarding the notion of *type*, for the reader's convenience. Firstly, observe that if a tensor field $C^{i_1\dots i_a}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)$ in the form (3.11) is of type A or B then all the complete contractions in the sum $Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_a}C^{i_1\dots i_a}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)$ will also be of type A or B. Secondly: Consider a set of complete contractions, $\{C^l_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p)\}_{l\in L}$, where all the complete contractions are in the form (3.11) with a given number σ_1 of factors $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$ and a given number P or factors $\nabla^{(B)}\Omega_h$. Let $L^A\subset L$ stand for the index set of complete contractions of type A and $L^B\subset L$ be the index set of complete contractions of type B. Assume an equation:

$$\sum_{l\in L}a_lC^l_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p)=0,$$

which is assumed to hold modulo complete contractions of length $\geq\sigma+2$. Then, using the fact that the above holds formally, we can easily derive that:

$$\sum_{l\in L^A}a_lC^l_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p)=0,$$

$$\sum_{l\in L^B}a_lC^l_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p)=0.$$

(Both the above equations hold modulo complete contractions of length $\geq\sigma+2$).

We are now ready to state our two main algebraic propositions:

Proposition 3.1 *Consider two linear combinations of acceptable tensor fields in the form (3.11), either all in the form B or all in the form A2,*

$$\sum_{l\in L_1}a_lC^{l,i_1\dots i_\alpha}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi),$$

$$\sum_{l\in L_2}a_lC^{l,i_1\dots i_{\beta_l}}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi),$$

where each tensor field above has length $\sigma+1\geq 4$ and a given number σ_1 of factors in the form $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$. We assume that for each $l\in L_2$, $\beta_l\geq\alpha+1$. We assume that modulo complete contractions of length $\geq\sigma+2$:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{l\in L_1}a_lXdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_\alpha}C^{l,i_1\dots i_\alpha}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)+\\&\sum_{l\in L_2}a_lXdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{\beta_l}}C^{l,i_1\dots i_{\beta_l}}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)=0.\end{aligned}\tag{3.12}$$

We claim that there is a linear combination, $\sum_{r\in R} a_r C^{r,i_1\dots i_{\alpha+1}}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p)$, *of acceptable* $(\alpha+1)$*-tensor fields in the form (3.11), all with length* $\sigma+1$ *and* σ_1 *factors* $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$ *and all of type B or type A2 respectively so that:*[41]

$$\sum_{l\in L_1} a_l C^{l,(i_1\dots i_\alpha)}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p)=\sum_{r\in R} a_r Xdiv_{i_{\alpha+1}} C^{r,(i_1\dots i_\alpha)i_{\alpha+1}}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p), \tag{3.13}$$

modulo terms of length $\geq \sigma+2$.

Second main algebraic Proposition:

Proposition 3.2 *Consider two linear combinations of acceptable tensor fields in the form (3.11), all in the form A1,*

$$\sum_{l\in L_1} a_l C^{l,i_1\dots i_\alpha}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi),$$

$$\sum_{l\in L_2} a_l C^{l,i_1\dots i_{\beta_l}}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi),$$

where each tensor field above has length $\sigma+1\geq 4$ *and a given number* σ_1 *of factors in the form* $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$. *We assume that for each* $l\in L_2$, $\beta_l\geq\alpha+1$. *Let* $\sum_{j\in J} a_j C^j_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)$ *stand for a generic linear combination of complete contractions in the form (3.11) of type A2.*

We assume that modulo complete contractions of length $\geq\sigma+2$:

$$\sum_{l\in L_1} a_l Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_\alpha} C^{l,i_1\dots i_\alpha}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)+$$
$$\sum_{l\in L_2} a_l Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{\beta_l}} C^{l,i_1\dots i_{\beta_l}}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)+\sum_{j\in J} a_j C^j_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)=0. \tag{3.14}$$

In the one case where $\alpha=1$ *and the tensor fields indexed in* L_1 *have no removable free index,*[42] *we impose the additional restriction that all the tensor fields indexed in* L_1 *must have the free index* ${}_{i_1}$ *not belonging to the factor against which* $\nabla\phi$ *is contracting.*

Our claim is that there is a linear combination of acceptable $(\alpha+1)$*-tensor fields in the form (3.11), all with length* $\sigma+1$ *and* σ_1 *factors* $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$ *and all of type type A1,* $\sum_{r\in R} a_r C^{r,i_1\dots i_{\alpha+1}}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p)$, *with length* σ *so that:*[43]

---

[41] Recall that given a β-tensor field $T^{i_1,\dots,i_\alpha\dots i_\beta}$, $T^{(i_1\dots i_\alpha)\dots i_\beta}$ stands for a new tensor field that arises from $T^{i_1,\dots,i_\alpha\dots i_\beta}$ by symmetrizing over the indices ${}^{i_1},\dots,{}^{i_\alpha}$.

[42] Notice that by definition and by weight considerations, if one of the tensor fields indexed in L_1 has this propoerty then *all* the tensor fields indexed in L_1 must have this property.

[43] Recall that given a β-tensor field $T^{i_1,\dots,i_\alpha\dots i_\beta}$, $T^{(i_1\dots i_\alpha)\dots i_\beta}$ stands for a new tensor field that arises from $T^{i_1,\dots,i_\alpha\dots i_\beta}$ by symmetrizing over the indices ${}^{i_1},\dots,{}^{i_\alpha}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{l\in L_1} a_l C^{l,(i_1\dots i_\alpha)}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi) = \\
&\sum_{r\in R} a_r Xdiv_{i_{\alpha+1}} C^{r,(i_1\dots i_\alpha)i_{\alpha+1}}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi) + \sum_{j\in J} a_j C^{j,(i_1\dots i_\alpha)}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi),
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.15}
$$

modulo terms of length $\geq \sigma+2$. *Here the tensor fields* $C^{j,(i_1\dots i_\alpha)}_g$ *are all acceptable and of type A2.*

Note: The conclusions of the two Propositions above involve (symmetric) *tensor fields* of rank α. Clearly, if we just introduce new factors $\nabla\upsilon$,[44] and contract it against the indices ${}^{i_1},\dots,{}^{i_\alpha}$ we see that equations (3.18) implies:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{l\in L_1} a_l C^{l,i_1\dots i_\alpha}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p)\nabla_{i_1}\upsilon\dots\nabla_{i_\alpha}\upsilon = \\
&\sum_{r\in R} a_r Xdiv_{i_{\alpha+1}} C^{r,i_1\dots i_\alpha i_{\alpha+1}}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p)\nabla_{i_1}\upsilon\dots\nabla_{i_\alpha}\upsilon,
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.16}
$$

modulo terms of length $\geq \sigma+\alpha+2$.[45] Similarly for (3.15). In fact, (3.16) and (3.18) are equivalent, since (3.16) holds formally. We will find it more convenient below to use (3.16) instead of (3.18) (and similarly, we will use the equation that arises from (3.15) by contracting the free indices against factors $\nabla\upsilon$).

Let us also state a Corollary of these two Propositions:

Corollary 1 *Consider two linear combinations of acceptable tensor fields in the form (3.11), (with no restriction on the "type" of the tensor fields):*

$$
\sum_{l\in L_1} a_l C^{l,i_1\dots i_\alpha}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi),
$$

$$
\sum_{l\in L_2} a_l C^{l,i_1\dots i_{\beta_l}}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi),
$$

where each tensor field above has length $\sigma+1\geq 4$ *and a given number* σ_1 *of factors in the form* $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$. *We assume that for each* $l\in L_2$, $\beta_l\geq\alpha+1$.

We assume that modulo complete contractions of length $\geq\sigma+2$*:*

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{l\in L_1} a_l Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_\alpha} C^{l,i_1\dots i_\alpha}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi) + \\
&\sum_{l\in L_2} a_l Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{\beta_l}} C^{l,i_1\dots i_{\beta_l}}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi) = 0.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.17}
$$

---

[44] Here $\nabla\upsilon$ is some scalar-valued function.

[45] Recall from [3] that for a tensor field $T^{j_1\dots j_\beta}_g(\phi,\upsilon)$ involving factors $\nabla\phi,\nabla\upsilon$, $Xdiv_{j_h}T^{j_1\dots j_\beta}_g(\phi,\upsilon)$ stands for the sublinear combination in $div_{j_h}T^{j_1\dots j_\beta}_g(\phi,\upsilon)$ where the derivative ∇^{j_h} is not allowed to hit to which the index ^{j_h} belongs, *nor* any of the factors $\nabla\upsilon,\nabla\phi$.

In the one case where $\alpha = 1$ and the tensor fields indexed in L_1 have no removable free index, we impose the additional restriction that all the tensor fields indexed in L_1 must have the free index ${}_{i_1}$ not belonging to the factor against which $\nabla\phi$ is contracting if the tensor field $C^{l,i_1}_g(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_p, \phi)$ is of type A1.

Our claim is then that there is a linear combination of acceptable $(\alpha+1)$-tensor fields in the form (3.11), all with length $\sigma+1$ and σ_1 factors $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$, $\sum_{r\in R} a_r C^{r,i_1\dots i_{\alpha+1}}_g(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_p)$, with length σ so that:

$$\sum_{l\in L_1} a_l C^{l,(i_1\dots i_\alpha)}_g(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_p, \phi) = \sum_{r\in R} a_r Xdiv_{i_{\alpha+1}} C^{r,(i_1\dots i_\alpha)i_{\alpha+1}}_g, \tag{3.18}$$

modulo terms of length $\geq \sigma+2$.

Corollary 1 follows from Propositons 3.1, 3.2: We prove this as follows: Divide the index sets L_1, L_2 into subsets L^A_1, L^B_1 and L^A_2, L^B_2, according to the following rule: We say $l \in L^A_1/l \in L^A_2$ if the tensor field $C^{l,i_1\dots i_\alpha}_g(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_p, \phi)/$ $C^{l,i_1\dots i_{\beta_l}}_g(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_p, \phi)$ is of type A. We say $l \in L^B_1/l \in L^B_2$ if the tensor field $C^{l,i_1\dots i_\alpha}_g(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_p, \phi)$ $/C^{l,i_1\dots i_{\beta_l}}_g(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_p, \phi)$ (in the form (3.11)) is of type B.[46] Observe that since (3.12) holds formally, then:

$$\begin{gathered}\sum_{l\in L^A_1} a_l Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_\alpha} C^{l,i_1\dots i_\alpha}_g(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_p, \phi)+ \\ \sum_{l\in L^A_2} a_l Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{\beta_l}} C^{l,i_1\dots i_{\beta_l}}_g(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_p, \phi) = 0,\end{gathered} \tag{3.19}$$

$$\begin{gathered}\sum_{l\in L^B_1} a_l Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_\alpha} C^{l,i_1\dots i_\alpha}_g(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_p, \phi)+ \\ \sum_{l\in L^B_2} a_l Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{\beta_l}} C^{l,i_1\dots i_{\beta_l}}_g(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_p, \phi) = 0,\end{gathered} \tag{3.20}$$

where both the above equations hold moldulo terms of length $\geq \sigma+2$. We will prove the claim of our Corollary *separately* for the two sublinear combinations indexed in L^A_1, L^A_2. We first prove (3.18) for the sublinear combination indexed in L^A_1:

We just appy Proposition 3.1 to (3.20) to derive that there exists a tensor field $\sum_{r\in R^A} a_r C^{r,i_1\dots i_{\alpha+1}}_g(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_p, \phi)$, as required by our Corollary, so that:

$$\sum_{l\in L^B_1} a_l C^{l(,i_1\dots i_\alpha)}_g(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_p, \phi) = \sum_{r\in R} a_r Xdiv_{i_{\alpha+1}} C^{r,(i_1\dots i_\alpha)i_{\alpha+1}}_g, \tag{3.21}$$

---

[46] See Definition 3.2.

modulo terms of length $\geq \sigma+1$. This proves (3.18) for the sublinear combination $\sum_{l\in L_1^B} a_l C_g^{l(,i_1\dots i_\alpha)}$.

Now, we prove (3.18) for the sublinear combination indexed in L_1^A. We claim:

Lemma 3.1 *Assume (3.19) and Proposition 3.2. Denote by $L_1^{A,*}\subset L_1^A$, $L_2^{A,*}\subset L_2^A$ the index set of tensor fields of type A_1. We claim:*

1. *There exists a tensor field $\sum_{r\in R^A} a_r C_g^{r,i_1\dots i_{\alpha+1}}(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)$, as required by Corollary 1, so that:*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{l\in L_1^{A,*}} a_l C_g^{l(,i_1\dots i_\alpha)}(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)=\sum_{r\in R^A} a_r Xdiv_{i_{\alpha+1}} C_g^{r,(i_1\dots i_\alpha)i_{\alpha+1}}\\&+\sum_{t\in T} a_t C_g^{l(,i_1\dots i_\alpha)}(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi),\end{aligned}\tag{3.22}$$

   where the partial contractions indexed in T in the RHS are all acceptable in the form (3.11) with length σ,σ_1 factors $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$ and have type $A2$. The above holds modulo partial contractions of length $\geq \sigma+2$.

2. *Assume (3.12), with the additional assumption that $L_1^{A,*}=\emptyset$ we claim that we can write:*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{l\in L_2^{A,*}} a_l Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{\beta_l}} C_g^{l,i_1\dots i_{\beta_l}}(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)=\\&\sum_{t\in T'} a_r Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{\beta_l}} C_g^{r,i_1\dots i_\alpha i_{\alpha+1}},\end{aligned}\tag{3.23}$$

   where the complete contractions indexed in T' in the RHS are all in the form (3.11) with length σ,σ_1 factors $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$, rank $\beta_l\geq\alpha+1$ and have type $A2$.The above holds modulo complete contractions of length $\geq\sigma+2$.

Observe that proving the above Lemma would imply Corollary 1:

We first prove (3.22); we invoke the last Lemma in the Appendix in [3] to derive:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{l\in L_1^{A,*}} a_l Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_\alpha} C_g^{l,i_1\dots i_\alpha}(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)=\\&\sum_{r\in R^A} a_r Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_\alpha} Xdiv_{i_{\alpha+1}} C_g^{r,i_1\dots i_\alpha i_{\alpha+1}}(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)\\&+\sum_{t\in T} a_t Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_\alpha} C_g^{l,i_1\dots i_\alpha}(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi),\end{aligned}\tag{3.24}$$

modulo complete contractions of length $\geq \sigma+2$. Now, replacing the above into (3.12), we derive a new local equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{l\in L_2^{A,*}} a_l Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{\beta_l}} C^{l,i_1\dots i_{\beta_l}}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)\\
&+\sum_{r\in R^A} a_r Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_\alpha} Xdiv_{i_{\alpha+1}} C^{r,i_1\dots i_\alpha i_{\alpha+1}}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)\\
&+\sum_{t\in T} a_t Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_\alpha} C^{l,i_1\dots i_\alpha}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)\\
&+\sum_{l\in L_1^A\setminus L_1^{A,*}} a_l Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_\alpha} C^{l,i_1\dots i_\alpha}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)=0,
\end{aligned}\tag{3.25}$$

which holds modulo terms of length $\geq \sigma+2$. Now, applying (3.23) to the above,[47] we derive that we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{l\in L_2^{A,*}} a_l Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{\beta_l}} C^{l,i_1\dots i_{\beta_l}}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)\\
&+\sum_{r\in R^A} a_r Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{\alpha+1}} C^{r,i_1\dots i_\alpha i_{\alpha+1}}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)\\
&=\sum_{t\in \tilde{T}} a_t Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{\beta_l}} C^{t,i_1\dots i_{\beta_l}}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi),
\end{aligned}\tag{3.26}$$

which holds modulo complete contractions of length $\sigma+2$. The complete contractions are as the ones indexed in T' in the RHS of (3.23).

Now, replacing the above into (3.25) we derive a new local equation, where all the tensor fields of length $\sigma+1$ are of type $A2$. Thus, we are in a position to apply Proposition 3.1. We derive that there exists a linear combination of $(\alpha+1)$-tensor fields as in the claim of Proposition 3.1, indexed im R^+ below, so that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{L_1^A\setminus L_1^{A,*}} a_l C^{l,i_1\dots i_{\beta_l}}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)+\sum_{t\in T} a_t C^{t,(i_1\dots i_\alpha)}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi)=\\
&\sum_{r\in R^+} a_r Xdiv_{i_{\alpha+1}} C^{r,i_1\dots i_\alpha i_{\alpha+1}}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi),
\end{aligned}\tag{3.27}$$

modulo terms of length $\geq \sigma+2$. Now, adding (3.22) and (3.27) we derive Corollary (1). □

---

[47] We treat the sum of $Xdiv$'s indexed in $T, L_1^A\setminus L_1^{A,*}$ as a generic linear combination $\sum_{j\in J}$ (see the statement of Proposition 3.2).

Proof of Lemma 3.1: The first claim follows by applying Proposition 3.1 to (3.19).[48]

To derive the second claim, we proceed by induction: Let $\beta_{min} > \alpha$ be the minimum rank among the tensor fields indexed in $L_1^{A,*}$; denote the corresponding index set by $L_1^{A,*,\alpha,\beta_{min}}$. We apply Proposition 3.2 to (3.12) (where the minimum rank among the tensor fields indexed in $L_1^{A,*}$ is now β_{min}); we derive that there exists a linear combination of partial contractions in the form (3.11) of type A_1, each with length σ, with σ_1 factors $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$ and rank $\beta_{min}+1$, indexed in R^A below, such that:

$$\sum_{l\in L_1^{A,*,\beta_{min}}} a_l C_g^{l,(i_1\dots i_{\beta_{min}})}(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi) =$$
$$\sum_{r\in R^A} a_r Xdiv_{i_{\beta_{min}+1}} C_g^{r,(i_1\dots i_{\beta_{min}})i_{\beta_{min}+1}} + \sum_{t\in T^A} a_t C_g^{l,(i_1\dots i_{\beta_{min}})}(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_p,\phi), \tag{3.28}$$

where the terms indexed in T^A have all the features of the tensor fields indexed in $L_1^{A,*,\beta_{min}}$, *but* they are of type $A2$ rather than $A1$. Iteratively applying the above step, we derive (3.23).[49] □

3.3 Proof of Lemma 1.4.

Recall that we are assuming that all the complete contractions $C^l(g), l \in L_\sigma^j$ in $P(g)$[50] have at least two of their internal contractions belonging to different factors. Observe that since $j \geq 2$ we must have $\sigma \leq \frac{n}{2}-2$.

We will again consider $I_g^1(\phi)(:= \frac{d}{dt}|_{t=0}[e^{nt\phi}P(e^{2t\phi}g)])$. Recall that using (3.1), (3.8), (3.9), (3.10) and the first two formulas from subsection 5.1 in [3] we may express $I_g^1(\phi)$ as a linear combination of complete contractions in the form:

$$contr(\nabla^{(m_1)}R_{ijkl}\otimes\dots\otimes\nabla^{(m_s)}R_{i'j'k'l'}\otimes\nabla^{(p_1)}Ric_{ab}\otimes\dots\otimes\nabla^{(p_q)}Ric_{a'b'}\otimes\nabla^{(\nu)}\phi) \tag{3.29}$$

Recall that for each $C^l(g)$ of length σ in $P(g)$, $Image^1_{\nabla\phi}[C^l(g)]$ stands for the sublinear combinations in $Image^1_\phi[C^l(g)]$[51] of contractions (in the form (3.29)) with $\nabla^{(\nu)}\phi = \nabla\phi$ or $\nabla^{(\nu)}\phi = \Delta\phi$, respectively.

---

[48] We treat the sum of $Xdiv$'s indexed in L_2 as a sum $\sum_{j\in J}\dots$, as in the statement of 3.2.

[49] Notice that since all local equations we deal with involve complete contractions of a fixed weight $-n$, the maximum possible number of free indiexes among tensor fields in the form (3.11) is $\frac{n}{2}$. Therefore we derive (3.23) after a *finite* number of iterations.

[50] Recall that $L_\sigma \subset L$ stands for the index set of complete contractions in $P(g)$ with (minimum) length σ. Recall that $L_\sigma^j \subset L_\sigma$ stands for the index set of complete contractions in $\sum_{l\in L_\sigma} a_l C^l(g)$ with the (minimum) number j of internal contractions.

[51] Recall that $Image^1_\phi[C^l(g)] = e^{n\phi}C^l(e^{2\phi}g) - C^l(g)$.

By virtue of the formulas in subsection 3.1 (see especially (3.1), (3.8), (3.9), (3.10) and also the first two formulas from subsection "Technical Tools" in [3]) we observe that all the complete contractions in $Image^1_{\nabla\phi}[\sum_{l\in L_\sigma} a_l C^l(g)]$ will have $\delta_R \ge j-1$; furthermore, (for the same reasons) it folows that any complete contraction with $\delta = j-1$ and with $\beta > 0$ factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric_{ab}$, then the indices ${}_{a}, {}_{b}$ in each such factor must contract against each other. We calculate:

$$Image^1_{\phi}[\sum_{l\in L_\sigma} a_l C^l(g)] = Image^1_{\nabla\phi}[\sum_{l\in L_\sigma} a_l C^l(g)] + \sum_{u\in U_{\Delta\phi}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) + \sum_{x\in X} a_x C^x_g(\phi), \tag{3.30}$$

where $\sum_{u\in U_{\Delta\phi}} a_u C^u_g(\phi)$ is a generic linear combination of terms in the form (3.29) with length $\sigma+1$ and a factor $\nabla^{(\nu)}\phi = \Delta\phi$. $\sum_{x\in X} a_x C^x_g(\phi)$stands for a generic linear combination of complete contractions in the form (3.29) with either length $\ge \sigma+2$ or with length $\sigma+1$ and a factor $\nabla^{(\nu)}\phi \ne \Delta\phi$.

On the other hand, we see that for any complete contraction $C^l(g)$ of length $\ge \sigma+1$ in $P(g)$:

$$Image^1_{\phi}[C^l(g)] = \sum_{u\in U_{\Delta\phi}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) + \sum_{x\in X} a_x C^x_g(\phi), \tag{3.31}$$

(with the same conventions as above).

For future reference we denote by $Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*}[P(g)|_\sigma]$ the sublinear combinations in $Image^1_{\phi}[P(g)|_\sigma]$ that consists of complete contractions with no factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$, and with a factor $\nabla\phi$.

Now, we need two main technical Lemmas for this subsection. We will be considering a linear combination $Y_g(\phi)$ in the form:

$$Y_g(\phi) = \sum_{v=0}^{\alpha}\{\sum_{u\in U^v_{\nabla\phi}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) + \sum_{u\in U^v_{\Delta\phi}} a_u C^u_g(\phi)\} + \sum_{x\in X} a_x C^x_g(\phi). \tag{3.32}$$

All the complete contractions $C^u_g(\phi)$ here have $\sigma+1$ factors. The linear combination $\sum_{x\in X} a_x C^x_g(\phi)$ is a generic linear combination as defined earlier (see discussion under (3.30)). Each complete contraction indexed in $U^v_{\nabla\phi}$, $v>0$ has a factor $\nabla\phi$ and v factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$ and *either* has $\delta_R \ge j$ *or* has $\delta_R = j-1$ but then also has the property that in all its v factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric_{ab}$ the indices ${}_{a}, {}_{b}$ are contracting against each other;[52] if $v=0$ then $\delta_R \ge j-1$. Each complete contraction indexed in $U^v_{\Delta\phi}$ has a factor $\Delta\phi$ and v factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$ and there is no restriction on δ_R. Thus α is an upper bound on the number of factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$ in the complete contractions $C^u_g(\phi)$ in $Y_g(\phi)$.

Note: Observe that $I^1_g(\phi)$ is of the form (3.32) above, where

$$\sum_{u\in U^v_{\nabla\phi}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) = Image^1_{\nabla\phi}[P(g)|_\sigma]. \tag{3.33}$$

---

[52] Equivalently, there are v factors $\nabla^{(p)}R$ of the differentiated scalar curvature.

Remark: We remark that in (3.33), each $C^u_g(\phi)$, $u \in U^v_{\nabla\phi}$ with $\beta > 0$ factors R (of the scalar curvature) will satisfy $\delta \geq j - 1 + 2\beta$. This follows from the decomposition of the Weyl tensor, since each factor R in $C^u_g(\phi)$ must have arisen from an (undifferentiated) factor W_{ijkl} in $P(g)|_\sigma$; thus a term with no internal contractions gives rise to a term with two internal contractions.

We claim the following:

Lemma 3.2 *Consider $Y_g(\phi)$ as in (3.32). Assume that $\int_{M^n} Y_g(\phi) dV_g = 0$. Let δ_{min} stand for the minimum δ_R among the complete contractions indexed in $U^\alpha_{\Delta\phi} \bigcup U^\alpha_{\nabla\phi}$.*[53] *We denote the corresponding index sets by $U^\alpha_{\Delta\phi,\delta_{min}}, U^\alpha_{\nabla\phi,\delta_{min}}$.*

In the case where $\delta_{min} < j - 1$,[54] *and in the case $\delta_{min} = j - 1$ under the additionnal assumption that $U^\alpha_{\nabla\phi,j-1} = \emptyset$, we claim that there is a linear combination of vector fields, $\sum_{h \in H} a_h C^h_g(\Delta\phi)$, each in the form (3.29) with $\nabla^{(\nu)}\phi = \Delta\phi$ and with one free index, so that:*

$$\sum_{u \in U^\alpha_{\Delta\phi,\delta_{min}}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) - div_i \sum_{h \in H} a_h C^{h,i}_g(\Delta\phi) = \sum_{u \in U^\alpha_{\Delta\phi,\delta_{min}+1}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) + \sum_{u \in U^{\alpha-1}_{\Delta\phi,\delta_{min}}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) + \sum_{x \in X} a_x C^x_g(\phi), \tag{3.34}$$

where the linear combinations in the RHS are generic linear combinations with the following properties: Each contraction indexed in $U^\alpha_{\Delta\phi,\delta_{min}+1}$ is in the form (3.29), has α factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$ and a factor $\Delta\phi$ and $\delta_R = \delta_{min}+1$. Each complete contraction indexed in $U^{\alpha-1}_{\Delta\phi,\delta_{min}}$ has $\alpha - 1$ factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$, $\delta_R = \delta_{min}$ and a factor $\Delta\phi$.

On the other hand, if $\delta_{min} \geq j - 1$, and $\alpha > 0$, we claim that there is a linear combination of vector fields, $\sum_{h \in H} a_h C^{h,i}_g(\phi)$, so that:

$$\sum_{u \in U^\alpha_{\nabla\phi,\delta_{min}} \bigcup U^\alpha_{\Delta\phi,\delta_{min}}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) - div_i \sum_{h \in H} a_h C^{h,i}_g(\phi) = \sum_{u \in U^\alpha_{\nabla\phi,\delta_{min}+1} \bigcup U^\alpha_{\Delta\phi,\delta_{min}+1}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) + \sum_{u \in U^{\alpha-1}_{\nabla\phi} \bigcup U^{\alpha-1}_{\Delta\phi}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) + \sum_{x \in X} a_x C^x_g(\phi), \tag{3.35}$$

where the linear combinations in the RHS are generic linear combinations with the following properties: The terms indexed in $U^\alpha_{\nabla\phi,\delta_{min}+1} \bigcup U^\alpha_{\Delta\phi,\delta_{min}+1}$ still

---

[53] In other words δ_{min} stands for the minimum number of internal contractions in curvature factors (i.e. factors in the form $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}, \nabla^{(p)}Ric_{ab}$), among the complete contractions with the maximum number α of factors in the form $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$, and having afactor $\Delta\phi$ or $\nabla\phi$. Observe by definition that if $\delta_{min} < j - 1$ then $U^\alpha_{\nabla\phi} = \emptyset$.

[54] (In which case $U^\alpha_{\nabla\phi} = \emptyset$ as noted in the previous footnote).

have α factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$ and $\delta_{min}+1$ internal contractions in total, while the ones indexed in $U^{\alpha-1}_{\nabla\phi}$ have $\alpha-1$ factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$ and $\delta_R\ge j$ and the ones in $U^{\alpha-1}_{\Delta\phi}$ have $\alpha-1$ factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$ (and there is no restriction on δ_R).

We will prove Lemma 3.2 further down. For the time being, we will show how it implies Lemma 1.4.

Lemma 3.2 implies Lemma 1.4:

Observe that iteratively applying the above Lemma, starting with $Y_g(\phi)=I^1_g(\phi)$, we derive that there is a vector field, $\sum_{h\in H}a_hC^{h,i}_g(\phi)$ so that:

$$\begin{aligned}&I^1_g(\phi)-div_i\sum_{h\in H}a_hC^{h,i}_g(\phi)=Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*}[P(g)|_\sigma]+\\&\sum_{u\in U^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta\ge j-1}}a_uC^u_g(\phi)+\sum_{u\in U^0_{\nabla\phi,\delta\ge j}}a_uC^u_g(\phi)+\sum_{x\in X}a_xC^x_g(\phi),\end{aligned}\tag{3.36}$$

where we recall that $Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*}[P(g)|_\sigma]$ stands for the sublinear combinations in $Image^1_\phi[P(g)|_\sigma]$ that consists of complete contractions with no factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$, and with a factor $\nabla\phi$. Also, $\sum_{u\in U^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta\ge j-1}}a_uC^u_g(\phi)$, $\sum_{u\in U^0_{\nabla\phi,\delta\ge j}}a_uC^u_g(\phi)$ stand for generic linear combinations of complete contractions in the form (3.29) with a factor $\nabla\phi,\Delta\phi$ respectively $\delta_R\ge j-1$, $\delta_R\ge j$ respectively.

Now, in order to prove Lemma 1.4 we examine the sublinear combination $Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*}[P(g)|_\sigma]$. We recall that $L^j_\sigma\subset L$ stands for the sublinear combination in $P(g)$ of complete contractions with length σ and j internal contractions. We recall that for each $C^l(g)$, $l\in L^j_\sigma$ there must be at least two internal contractions belonging to different factors. For every $l\in L^j_\sigma$ we denote by $Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*,+}[P(g)|_\sigma]$ the sublinear combination in $Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*}[P(g)|_\sigma]$ with $\delta_R=j-1$.

Thus, we derive:

$$Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*}[P(g)|_\sigma]=Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*,+}[P(g)|_\sigma]+\sum_{h\in H}a_hC^h_g(\phi),\tag{3.37}$$

where each $C^h_g(\phi)$ is in the form (3.29), has $\delta\ge j$, no factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$ and a factor $\nabla\phi$ (notice this fits into the generic linear combination $\sum_{u\in U^0_{\nabla\phi,\delta\ge j}}a_uC^u_g(\phi)$).

In view of the above, we may integrate (3.36) to derive a global equation of the form:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{M^n}Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*,+}[P(g)|_\sigma]+\sum_{u\in U^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta\ge j-1}}a_uC^u(g)\Delta\phi\\&+\sum_{u\in U^0_{\nabla\phi,\delta\ge j}}a_uC^u_g(\phi)+\sum_{x\in X}a_xC^x_g(\phi)dV_g=0.\end{aligned}\tag{3.38}$$

We now show how to derive Lemma 1.4 from the above. In order to do so, we will introduce some more notational conventions.

Definition 3.4 *For each tensor field $C_g^{i_1\dots i_\alpha}$ in the form*

$$pcontr(\nabla^{(m_1)}W_{ijkl}\otimes\dots\otimes\nabla^{(m_\sigma)}W_{i'j'k'l'})$$

we will associate a list of numbers, which we will call the character of $C_g^{l,i_1\dots i_\alpha}$: We list out the factors $T_1,\dots T_\sigma$ of $C_g^{l,i_1\dots i_\alpha}$ and we define $List(l)=(L_1,\dots,L_\sigma)$ as follows: L_i will stand for the number of free indices that belong to the factor T_i. We then define $\vec{\kappa}(l)$ to stand for the decreasing rearrangement of $List(l)$.[55] *With a slight abuse of notation, we will also consider the complete contractions in the index set L^j_σ in $P(g)=\sum_{l\in L}a_LC^l(g)$ and define their character to be the character of the tensor field $C_g^{l,i_1\dots i_j}$ that arises from C^l_g by replacing all the internal contractions by free indices.*

We can thus group up the different j-tensor fields indexed in L^j_σ according to their double characters: Let $\vec{K}$ stand for the set of all the different characters appearing among the tensor fields indexed in L^j_σ. We write $L^j_\sigma=\bigcup_{\vec{\kappa}\in\vec{K}}L^{j,\vec{\kappa}}_\sigma$; here $L^{j,\vec{\kappa}}_\sigma\subset L^j_\sigma$ stands for the index set of j-tensor fields with a character $\vec{\kappa}$.

We also introduce a partial ordering among characters according to lexicographic comparison: a character $\vec{\kappa}_2$ is subsequent to $\vec{\kappa}_1$ if $\vec{\kappa}_1$ is lexicographically greater than $\vec{\kappa}_2$.

Notice that any two different characters are *comparable*, in the sense that one will be subsequent to the other.

Now, we return to the derivation of Lemma 1.4: We will again proceed by induction. We break up L^j_σ into subsets $L^{j,\vec{\kappa}}_\sigma$ that index complete contractions $C^l(g)$ with the same character, $\vec{\kappa}$.[56] There is a finite list of possible characters; we denote the set of characters of the complete contractions in L^j_σ by $\vec{K}$.

If $\vec{K}=\emptyset$ there is nothing to prove. If $\vec{K}\neq\emptyset$, we pick out the maximal character $\vec{\kappa}_{max}\in\vec{K}$. We will show the claim of Lemma 1.4 for the sublinear combination $\sum_{l\in L^{j,\vec{\kappa}_{max}}_\sigma}a_lC^l(g)$. In other words, we will prove that there exists a linear combination of partial contractions, $\sum_{h\in H}a_hC^{h,i}(g)$, where each $C^{h,i}(g)$ is in the form (1.3) with weight $-n+1$ and $\delta_W=j$, so that:

$$\sum_{l\in L^{j,\vec{\kappa}_{max}}_\sigma}a_lC^l(g)-div_i\sum_{h\in H}a_hC^{h,i}(g)=\sum_{v\in V}a_vC^v(g) \tag{3.39}$$

where each $C^v(g)$ is in the form (1.2) with $\delta_W\geq j+1$. Moreover, each $C^v(g)$ will have at least two internal contractions belonging to different factors. The above equation holds modulo complete contractions of length $\geq\sigma+1$.

---

[55] Thus the character is ultimately a list of numbers. We can also refer to an abstract "character" $\vec{\kappa}$, which does not necessarily need to correspond to a particular tensor field. We also note that two different tensor fields can have the same character.

[56] Recall that the character of a complete contraction $C(g)$ (with factors $\nabla^{(m)}W_{ijkl}$) was defined to be the character of the tensor field that formally arises from $C(g)$ by making all internal contractions into free indices.

Clearly, if we can show that claim then Lemma 1.4 will follow by induction.

Proof of (3.39): We introduce some notational normalizations. We write out $\vec{\kappa}_{max} = (k_1, \dots, k_a)$, where if $i < j$ then $k_i \geq k_j$.[57] Note that k_1 is the maximum number of internal contractions that can belong to a given factor among all complete contractions in L^j_σ. This follows by the definition of ordering among different refined double characters. By the hypothesis of Lemma 1.4 we have that $a \geq 2$ (this reflects the fact that not all internal contractions can belong to the same factor). Now, let b be the largest number for which $k_{a-b+1}, \dots, k_a = k_{min}$ have the same value. In other words, for each $l \in L^{j,\vec{\kappa}_{max}}_\sigma$ there are b different factors $\nabla^{(m)} W_{ijkl}$, with k_{min} internal contractions each. For notational convenience, we will assume that the last $b \cdot k_{min}$ free indices in $C^{l,i_1 \dots i_j}(g)$ correspond to those internal contractions (i.e. they arise from those internal contractions when we make the internal contractions in $C^l(g)$ into free indices in $C^{l,i_1 \dots i_j}(g)$).

Now, we will say that a $(j-1)$-tensor field in the form

$$pcontr(\nabla^{(m_1)} W_{ijkl} \otimes \dots \otimes \nabla^{(m_\sigma)} W_{i'j'k'l'} \otimes \nabla\phi)$$

has double-character $\vec{\kappa}'_{max}$ if its $j-1$ free indices are distributed among its factors according to the pattern: $(k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{a-1}, k_{min} - 1)$ (in other words one factor T_1 has k_1 free indices, the next factor T_2 has k_2 free indices etc) *and* the factor with $k_a - 1$ free indices is also contracting against the factor $\nabla\phi$. As above, we will extend this definition to complete contractions in the form

$$contr(\nabla^{(m_1)} W_{ijkl} \otimes \dots \otimes \nabla^{(m_\sigma)} W_{i'j'k'l'} \otimes \nabla\phi),$$

with $j-1$ internal contractions: We will say that such a complete contraction $C_g(\phi)$ has a double-character $\vec{\kappa}'_{max}$ if the tensor field $C^{i_1 \dots i_{j-1}}_g(\phi)$ which arises from $C_g(\phi)$ by making all the internal contractions into free indices has a double-character $\vec{\kappa}'_{max}$.

We then examine the complete contractions in $Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*,+}[P(g)|_\sigma]$; in particular we seek to understand the sublinear combination with double character $\vec{\kappa}'_{max}$. Denote this sublinear combination by $\{Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*,+}[P(g)|_\sigma]\}_{\vec{\kappa}'_{max}}$. Using formulas (3.8), (3.9), (3.10) we can straightforwardly descibe $Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*,+}[P(g)|_\sigma]$:

This sublinear combination arises *exclusively* from the sublinear combination $\sum_{l \in L^{j,\vec{\kappa}_{max}}_\sigma} a_l C^l(g)$ in $P(g)$ via the following process: Consider each $C^l(g)$, $l \in L^{j,\vec{\kappa}_{max}}_\sigma$ and list out its σ factors $T^l_1, \dots T^l_\sigma$; for each factor T^l_a we let $Subst^{\nabla\phi}_a[C^l(g)]$ stand for the (linear combination of) complete contractions that arises from $C^l(g)$ by replacing T^l_a by one of the terms explicitly written out in the RHSs of (3.8), (3.9), (3.10)[58] and then replacing all the other factors $T^l_b = \nabla^{(m)} W_{ijkl}$, $b = 1, \dots, a-1, a+1, \dots \sigma$, by either $\frac{n-3}{n-2}\nabla^{(m)} R_{ijkl}$ or

---

[57] Recall that each number k_s stands for the number of internal contractions in some given factor in $\vec{\kappa}_{Max}$. The second restriction reflects the fact that the list is taken in decreasing rearrangement

[58] (Which of the equations we use depends on how many internal contractions in T^l_a involve internal indices).

$\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$ (depending on whether T^l_b has an internal contraction involving an internal index or not). Then, just by virtue of the formulas (3.8), (3.9), (3.10) and the first two formulas in the subsection 5.1 in [3], we calculate:

$$Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*,+}[P(g)|_\sigma] = \sum_{l\in L^{j,\vec{\kappa}_{max}}_\sigma} a_l \sum_{a=1}^{\sigma} Subst^{\nabla\phi}_a[C^l(g)] + \sum_{negligible} C_g(\nabla\phi), \tag{3.40}$$

where $\sum_{negligible} C_g(\nabla\phi)$ stands for a generic linear combination of complete contractions in the form $contr(\nabla^{(m_1}R_{ijkl}\otimes\dots\otimes\nabla^{(m_\sigma)}R_{i'j'k'l'}\otimes\nabla\phi)$ with $j-1$ internal contractions in total and with the factor $\nabla\phi$ contracting against the index ${}_j$ in a factor $T=\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$ for which the index ${}_i$ is internally contracting in T.

Note: Notice that in the first linear combination in the RHS there can be at most k_1 internal contractions in any of the factors in any $C_g(\nabla\phi)$.

Given (3.40) we are able to explicitly write out the sublinear combination $\{Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*,+}[P(g)|_\sigma]\}_{\vec{\kappa}'_{max}}$ in $Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*,+}[P(g)|_\sigma]$ of terms with a double character $\vec{\kappa}'_{max}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\{Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*,+}[P(g)|_\sigma]\}_{\vec{\kappa}'_{max}} &= \sum_{l\in L^{j,\vec{\kappa}_{max}}_\sigma} a_l \sum_{f=\sigma-b\cdot k_{min}+1}^{\sigma} (Const)_{l,f} C^{l,\iota|i_f}(g)\nabla_{i_f} \\ &+ \sum_{negligible} C_g(\nabla\phi).\end{aligned} \tag{3.41}$$

Here $C^{l,\iota|i_f}(g)$ stands for the vector field that arises from $C(g)$ by formally replacing all factors $\nabla^{(m)}W_{ijkl}$ by $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$ and then making the f^{th} internal contraction into a free index ${}_{i_f}$.

Although the full description of the exact form of $\{Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*,+}[P(g)|_\sigma]\}_{\vec{\kappa}'_{max}}$ is rather messy, all that is really important here is to note that by applying the operation $Weylify$ (see subsection 5.1 in [3]) to this sublinear combination, one can *recover* the sublinear combination $\sum_{l\in L^{j,\vec{\kappa}_{max}}_\sigma} a_l C^l(g)$ in $P(g)$:

Let us define a formal opeartion Op which acts on the complete contractions above by replacing all internal contractions by factors $\nabla\upsilon$, setting $\phi=\upsilon$ and then acting on the resulting complete contractions by the operation $Weylify$. It follows from the discussion above (3.40), (3.41) and the definition of the operation $Weylify$ in [3] that:

$$Op[\{Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*,+}[P(g)|_\sigma]\}_{\vec{\kappa}'_{max}}] = \sum_{l\in L^{j,\vec{\kappa}_{max}}_\sigma} a_l\cdot[b\cdot(k_{min}\cdot((n-2)-4\binom{k_{min}}{2}))]C^l(g). \tag{3.42}$$

Two notes are in order: Firstly that the coefficient $[b\cdot(k_{min}\cdot((n-2)-4\binom{k_{min}}{2}))]$ is *universal*, i.e. it depends only on the character $\vec{\kappa}_{max}$ (thus it can be factored out in the RHS of (3.42)), and secondly that it is non-zero: This follows from the simple observation that $b\ge 1$ by definition and $l\le\frac{n}{2}-3$, since the complete contractions $C^l(g)$ have weight $-n$ and involve factors $\nabla^{(m)}W_{ijkl}$ and $\sigma\ge 3$.

We now consider the linear combination $\sum_{u\in U^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta\ge j-1}} a_u C^u_g(\phi)$. We denote by $\sum_{u\in U^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}} a_u C^u_g(\phi)$ the sublinear combination that consists of complete contractions with $\delta_R=j-1$.

Now, let us also denote by $A=k_1$, where k_1 is the first number on the list $(k_1,\dots,k_a)$ for $\vec{\kappa}_{max}$ above. We will pay special attention to the complete contractions in $\sum_{u\in U^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}} a_u C^u_g(\phi)$ which have a factor $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$ with A internal contractions. We denote the index set of those complete contractions by $SU^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}\subset U^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}$.

We claim that there is a linear combination of vector fields $C^{h,i}(g)\Delta\phi$ (in the form (3.29) without factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$ and with $\nabla^{(\nu)}\phi=\Delta\phi$), so that:

$$\sum_{u\in SU^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}} a_u C^u_g\cdot\Delta\phi - div_i\sum_{h\in H} a_h C^{h,i}(g)\Delta\phi = \sum_{u\in U^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j}} a_u C^u_g\cdot\Delta\phi + \sum_{x\in X} a_x C^x_g(\phi), \tag{3.43}$$

where $\sum_{u\in U^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j}} a_u C^u_g\cdot\Delta\phi$ stands for a generic linear combination of complete contractions in the form (3.29) with $\nabla^{(\nu)}\phi=\Delta\phi$ and with $\delta_R=j$.

We prove (3.43) after showing that it implies Lemma 1.4.

(3.43) implies Lemma 1.4: Plugging (3.43) into (3.38), we may assume that no complete contractions $C^u_g\cdot\Delta\phi$ in (3.38) with $\delta_R=j-1$ have a factor $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$ with A internal contractions. In other words (3.38)[59] can now be rewritten in the form:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{M^n}\sum_{l\in L^{j,\vec{\kappa}_{max}}_\sigma} a_l\sum_{f=\sigma-b\cdot k_{min}+1}^{\sigma}(Const)_{l,f}C^{l,\iota|i_f}(g)\nabla_{i_f}+\sum_{negligible}C_g(\nabla\phi)+\\ &\sum_{l\in L^{j,\sharp}_\sigma} a_l C^{l,\iota}(g)\nabla_{i_j}\phi+\sum_{h\in H}a_h C^h_g(\nabla\phi)+\sum_{u\in U^{0,*}_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}} a_u C^u_g\cdot\Delta\phi+\\ &\sum_{u\in U^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta\ge j}} a_u C^u_g\cdot\Delta\phi+\sum_{x\in X}a_x C^x_g(\phi)dV_g=0.\end{aligned}\tag{3.44}$$

Here each compete contraction indexed in $L^{j,\sharp}_\sigma$ has $j-1$ internal contractions and a factor $\nabla\phi$, but its double character is *not* $\vec{\kappa}'_{max}$. The complete contractions indexed in H are in the form (3.29) with $\delta_R \geq j$ and no factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$. The complete contractions in $U^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta\geq j}$ have a factor $\Delta\phi$ and $\delta \geq j$, while the ones indexed in $U^{0,*}_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}$ have $\delta = j-1$ but also have no factor $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$ with A internal contractions.

---

[59] See also the notational convention introduced in (3.41)

Integrating by parts with respect to the factor $\Delta\phi$ in the second line of (3.44) we derive:

$$\int_{M^n} \sum_{l\in L^{j,\vec{\kappa}_{max}}_\sigma} a_l \sum_{f=\sigma-b\cdot k_{min}+1}^{\sigma} (Const)_{l,f} C^{l,\iota|i_f}(g)\nabla_{i_f} + \sum_{negligible} C_g(\nabla\phi)+ \\ \sum_{l\in L^{j,\sharp}_\sigma} a_l C^{l,\iota}(g)\nabla_{i_a}\phi + \sum_{h\in H} a_h C^h_g(\nabla\phi) - \sum_{u\in U^{0,*}_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}} a_u \nabla^i[C^u_g]\cdot\nabla_i\phi- \\ \sum_{u\in U^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta\geq j}} a_u\nabla^i[C^u_g]\cdot\nabla_i\phi + \sum_{x\in X} a_x C^x_g(\phi)dV_g = 0. \tag{3.45}$$

(Note that the above equation has been derived independently of (3.43)).

We denote the integrand of the above by $M_g(\phi)$. We apply the "main conclusion" of the super divergence formula to the above integral equation (see subsection 2.2 in [3]) and we pick out the sublinear combination $supdiv_+[M_g(\phi)]$ of terms with length $\sigma+1$, a factor $\nabla\phi$ and no internal contractions. Since the super divergence formula holds formally we derive that $supdiv_+[M_g(\phi)] = 0$ modulo a linear combination of terms of length $\geq \sigma+2$. Thus we derive an equation:

$$\sum_{l\in L^{j,\vec{\kappa}_{max}}_\sigma} a_l \sum_{f=0}^{b\cdot k_{min}-1} (Const)_{l,f} Xdiv_{i_1}\dots X\hat{div}_{i_{j-f}}\dots Xdiv_{i_a} C^{l,\iota|i_1\dots i_j}(g)\nabla_{i_{j-f}}\phi+ \\ \sum_{negligible} Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{j-1}} C^{i_1\dots i_{j-1}}_g(\nabla\phi) + \sum_{l\in L^{j,\sharp}_\sigma} a_l Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{j-1}} \\ C^{l,\iota|i_1\dots i_j}(g)\nabla_{i_j}\phi + \sum_{h\in H} a_h Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{z_h}} C^{h,i_1\dots i_{z_h}}_g(\nabla\phi) \\ - \sum_{u\in U^{0,*}_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}} a_u Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{j-1}}\nabla^i[C^{u,i_1\dots i_{j-1}}_g]\cdot\nabla_i\phi \\ - \sum_{u\in U^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta\geq j}} a_u Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{u_h}}\nabla^i[C^u_g]^{i_1\dots i_{u_h}}\cdot\nabla_i\phi = 0; \tag{3.46}$$

(the linear combination $\sum_{negligible} Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{j-1}} C^{i_1\dots i_{j-1}}_g(\nabla\phi)$ just arises from the linear combination of complete contractions $\sum_{negligible} C_g(\nabla\phi)$ by making all the internal contractions into free indices and then taking $Xdiv$ of the resulting free indices).

We now apply Corollary 1 to the above; we pick out the sublinear combination of $(j-1)$-tensor fields with A factors $\nabla\upsilon$ contracting against some factor $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$ (this sublinear combination vanishes separately). We then pick out the sublinear combination of complete contractions with the property that the factors $\nabla\upsilon$ are contracting according to the following pattern: k_1 factors $\nabla\upsilon$ must contract against one factor T_1; k_2 factors $\nabla\upsilon$ must contract against some other factor T_2; k_3 factors $\nabla\upsilon$ must contract against a third factor T_3; $\dots$; k_a-1 factors $\nabla\upsilon$ must contract against an a^{th} factor T_a *and, in this last case* the factor $\nabla\phi$ must also contract against this factor T_a.[60] Observe that the sublinear combination of those terms *must vanish separately*, since the equation to which this sublinear combination belongs holds formally. We thus obtain a new true equation which is in the form:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{l\in L^{j,\vec{\kappa}_{max}}_{\sigma}} a_l \sum_{f=0}^{b\cdot k_{min}-1} C^{l,\iota|i_1\dots i_j}(g)\nabla_{i_{j-f}}\phi\nabla_{i_1}\upsilon\dots\hat{\nabla}_{i_{j-f}}\upsilon\dots\nabla_{i_j}\upsilon+\\ &\sum_{negligible} C^{i_1\dots i_{j-1}}_g(\nabla\phi)\nabla_{i_1}\upsilon\dots\nabla_{i_{j-1}}\upsilon\\ &-Xdiv_{i_{j+1}}\sum_{h\in H} a_h C^{h,i_1\dots i_{j+1}}_g\nabla_{i_1}\phi\nabla_{i_2}\upsilon\dots\nabla_{i_j}\upsilon=0;\end{aligned}\tag{3.47}$$

(all tensor fields indexed in H are acceptable).

Then, setting $\upsilon=\phi$[61] and then applying the operation $Weylify$ (see subsection 5.1 in [3] and also (3.42)), we derive that Lemma 1.4 follows from (3.43). □

Proof of (3.43): We again refer to (3.45),[62] (denote the integrand by $M_g(\phi)$) and apply the super divergence formula to this equation; denote the resulting local equation by *supdiv*$[M_g(\phi)]=0$. We pick out the sublinear combination *supdiv*$[M_g(\phi)]_+$ of terms of length $\sigma+1$ with a factor $\nabla\phi$ and with no internal contractions. This sublinear combination must vanish separately and we thus derive an equation:

---

[60] Recall that the double-character $\vec{\kappa}'_{max}$ was defined to be the character $(k_1,\dots,k_2,k_3,\dots,k_{a-1},k_a-1)$.

[61] Notice that this operation will kill the sublinear combination $\sum_{negligible}\dots$.

[62] Recall the note after that equation, which shows that it has been derived independently of (3.43).

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{l\in L^{j-1}} a_l Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{j-1}} C^{l|i_1\dots i_j}(g)\nabla_{i_j}\phi\\&+\sum_{h\in H} a_h Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{z_h}} C^{h,i_1\dots i_{z_h}}_g(\nabla\phi)\\&-\sum_{u\in U^{0,*}_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}} a_u Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{j-1}}\nabla^i[C^{u,i_1\dots i_{j-1}}_g]\cdot\nabla_i\phi\\&-\sum_{u\in U^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta\ge j}} a_u Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{u_h}}\nabla^i[C^u_g]^{i_1\dots i_{u_h}}\cdot\nabla_i\phi=0;\end{aligned}\tag{3.48}$$

here the terms indexed in L^{j-1} are in the form (3.11), have rank $j-1$ *and also have at most $A-1$ free indices belonging to the factor against which $\nabla\phi$ contracts*; they have arisen from the complete contractions in $Image^1_{\nabla\phi,*,+}[P(g)|_\sigma]$ in (3.38). The tensor fields $C^u_g]^{i_1\dots i_{u_h}}$, $C^{u,i_1\dots i_{j-1}}_g$ arise from the complete contractions $C^h_g(\phi)$, $C^u(g)$ in (3.38) by replacing each internal contraction by a free index.

We denote by $H_*\subset H$ the index set of tensor fields in the above equation where the factor $\nabla\phi$ is contracting against an internal index. We also denote by $L^{j-1,*}\subset L^{j-1}$ the index set of $(j-1)$-tensor fields for which the factor $\nabla\phi$ is contracting agianst an internal index in some factor $\nabla^{(m)}R_{abcd}$.[63] Now, by applying Lemma 3.1 to the above equation, we derive that we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{l\in L^{j-1,*}} a_l Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{j-1}} C^{l|i_1\dots i_j}(g)\nabla_{i_j}\phi\\&+\sum_{h\in H_*} a_h Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{z_h}} C^{h,i_1\dots i_{z_h}}_g(\nabla\phi)=\\&\sum_{l\in \tilde{L}^{j-1}} a_l Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{j-1}} C^{l|i_1\dots i_j}(g)\nabla_{i_j}\phi\\&+\sum_{h\in H^\sharp} a_h Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{z_h}} C^{h,i_1\dots i_{z_h}}_g(\nabla\phi),\end{aligned}\tag{3.49}$$

where the terms indexed in $\tilde{L}^{j-1}$ the RHS stand for a generic linear combination of tensor fields in the form (3.11), each with rank $j-1$ *and with the factor $\nabla\phi$ contracting against a derivative index and at most $A-1$ free indices in any given factor*; $H^\sharp$ indexes a generic linear combination of tensor fields in the form (3.11), each with rank $>j-1$ *and with the factor $\nabla\phi$ contracting against a derivative index.* Therefore, replacing the above into (3.48) we derive a new equation in the form:

---

[63] Recall that for each of these last tensor fields there can be at most $A-1$ free indices in any given factor.

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{l\in\tilde{L}^{j-1}} a_l Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{j-1}} C^{l|i_1\dots i_j}(g)\nabla_{i_j}\phi\\&+\sum_{h\in H^\sharp} a_h Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{z_h}} C^{h,i_1\dots i_{z_h}}_g(\nabla\phi)-\\&\sum_{u\in U^{0,*}_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}} a_u Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{j-1}}\nabla^i[C^{u,i_1\dots i_{j-1}}_g]\cdot\nabla_i\phi-\\&\sum_{u\in U^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta\ge j}} a_u Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{u_h}}\nabla^i[C^u_g]^{i_1\dots i_{u_h}}\cdot\nabla_i\phi=0,\end{aligned}\tag{3.50}$$

where the linear combinations indexed in $\tilde{L}^{j-1}$ and $H^\sharp$ are *generic* linear combinations of the forms described in the above paragraph.

Now, for each $u\in SU^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}$, we denote by $\nabla^i_{@}[C^{u,i_1\dots i_{j-1}}(g)]\nabla_i\phi$ the sublinear combination in $\nabla^i[C^{u,i_1\dots i_{j-1}}(g)]\nabla_i\phi$ where ∇^i is *forced* to hit a factor with A free indices.[64] Now, we break up the index set $SU^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}$ into subsets $SU^{0,\vec{\kappa}}_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}$ that index tensor fields with the same character.[65] We denote by K the index set of those subsets. We claim that for every $\vec{\kappa}\in K$ there is a linear combination of $(j+1)$-vector fields $\sum_{h\in H^{\vec{\kappa}'}} a_h C^{i_1\dots i_{j+1}}(g)\nabla_{i_1}\phi$ with a character $\vec{\kappa}$ (also recall that $\nabla\phi$ is contracting against a derivative index) so that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{u\in SU^{0,\vec{\kappa}}_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}} a_u\nabla^i_{@}[C^{u,i_2\dots i_j}(g)]\nabla_i\phi\nabla_{i_2}\upsilon\dots\nabla_{i_j}\upsilon\\&-Xdiv_{i_{j+1}}\sum_{h\in H^{\vec{\kappa}'}} a_h C^{i_1\dots i_{j+1}}(g)\nabla_{i_1}\phi\nabla_{i_2}\upsilon\dots\nabla_{i_j}\upsilon=0.\end{aligned}\tag{3.51}$$

Let us check how (3.51) implies (3.45):

We observe that for each $\vec{\kappa}\in K$, there is a nonzero combinatorial constant $(Const)_{\vec{\kappa}}$ so that for any $u\in SU^{0,\vec{\kappa}}_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}$:

$$Erase_{\nabla\phi}\{\nabla^i_{@}[C^{u,i_1\dots i_{j-1}}(g)]\nabla_i\phi\}=(Const)_{\vec{\kappa}}C^{u,i_1\dots i_{j-1}}(g).\tag{3.52}$$

(In fact $(Const)_{\vec{\kappa}}$ just stands for the number of factors in $\vec{\kappa}$ that have A free indices). To see this clearly observe that if $\vec{\kappa}=(s_1,\dots s_a)$ (where $s_i\ge s_{i+1}$ and $s_1=A$) that means that each tensor field $C^{u,i_1\dots i_{j-1}}(g)$ will have a factor F_1 with $s_1=A$ free indices, a second factor F_2 with s_2 free indices, …, and an a^{th} factor F_a with s_a free indices. Then if $A=s_1=s_2=\dots s_c$ and $s_{c+1}<A$, $\nabla^i_{@}[C^{u,i_1\dots i_{j-1}}(g)]$ stands for the sublinear combintaion in $\nabla^i[C^{u,i_1\dots i_{j-1}}(g)]$ where ∇^i is forced to hit one of the factors $F_1,\dots,F_c$.

---

[64] Recall that $SU^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}\subset U^0_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}$ is exactly the index set of $(j-1)$-tensor fields which have at least one such factor.

[65] In other words with the same pattern of distribution of free indices among the different factors in $C^{u,i_1\dots i_{j-1}}(g)$.

Now, applying the operation $Erase_\phi$ (see the Appendix in [3]) to the above and then making the factors $\nabla\upsilon$ into internal contractions and finally multiplying by $\Delta\phi$, we derive (3.43).

Proof of (3.51): We apply Proposition 3.1 to (3.50), deriving that there is a linear combination of tensor fields of type A1, $\sum_{t\in T} a_t C^{t,(i_1\dots i_{j-1})i_j i_{j+1}}(g)\nabla_{i_j}\phi$, (this means that the factors $\nabla\phi$ is contracting against a derivative index in some factor $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$) so that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{l\in\tilde{L}^{j-1}} a_l C^{l|i_1\dots i_{j-1}i_j}(g)\nabla_{i_j}\phi\nabla_{i_1}\upsilon\dots\nabla_{i_{j-1}}\upsilon\\ &-\sum_{u\in U^{0,*}_{\Delta\phi,\delta=j-1}} a_u\nabla^i[C^{u,i_1\dots i_{j-1}}_g]\cdot\nabla_i\phi\nabla_{i_1}\upsilon\dots\nabla_{i_{j-1}}\upsilon\\ &=\sum_{t\in T} a_t Xdiv_{i_{j+1}}C^{t,i_1\dots i_{j-1}i_j i_{j+1}}(g)\nabla_{i_j}\phi.\nabla_{i_1}\upsilon\dots\nabla_{i_{j-1}}\upsilon.\end{aligned}\tag{3.53}$$

Now, in the above equations we pick out the sublinear combination of terms where the factor $\nabla\phi$ and the factors $\nabla\upsilon$ are contracting according to the following pattern: The factor $\nabla\phi$ must contract against a factor F_1 which is also contracting against another A factors $\nabla\upsilon$. A second factor F_2 contracts against s_2 factors $\nabla\upsilon$, ... and an a^{th} factor F_a contracts against s_a factors $\nabla\upsilon$. *This sublinear combination must vanish separately since (3.53) holds formally.* Thus we derive (3.51).

We have proven (3.43). □

Proof of Lemma 3.2:

We prove (3.34) and (3.35). We will start with (3.34), and we will first prove this equation under a simplifying assumption; our simplifying assumption is that no complete contraction in $\sum_{u\in U^\alpha_{\nabla\phi}\bigcup U^\alpha_{\Delta\phi}} a_u C^u_g(\phi)$ has a factor R of the scalar curvature. After we complete this proof under the simplifying assumption, we will explain how the general case can be derived by fitting the argument below to a new downward induction on the maximum number of factors R of the scalar curvature, precisely as in subsection 5.4 in [3].

Proof of (3.34) under the simplifying assumption: Denote by $C^u_g(\phi,\Omega^\alpha)$ the complete contraction that arises from each $C^u_g(\phi)$, $u\in U^\alpha$, by formally replacing the α factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$ by factors $\nabla^{(p+2)}\Omega$. Thus, $C^u_g(\phi)$, $u\in U^\alpha_{\nabla\phi}, u\in U^\alpha_{\Delta\phi}$ will be in one of the forms:

$$\begin{aligned}&contr(\nabla^{a_1\dots a_t}\nabla^{(m_1)}R_{ijkl}\otimes\dots\nabla^{b_1\dots b_v}\nabla^{(m_s)}R_{i'j'k'l'}\\ &\otimes\nabla^{y_1\dots y_w}\nabla^{(p_1+2)}\Omega\otimes\dots\nabla^{x_1\dots x_o}\nabla^{(p_\alpha+2)}\Omega\otimes\nabla\phi),\end{aligned}\tag{3.54}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&contr(\nabla^{a_1\dots a_t}\nabla^{(m_1)}R_{ijkl}\otimes\dots\nabla^{b_1\dots b_v}\nabla^{(m_s)}R_{i'j'k'l'}\\
&\otimes\nabla^{y_1\dots y_w}\nabla^{(p_1+2)}\Omega\otimes\dots\nabla^{x_1\dots x_o}\nabla^{(p_\alpha+2)}\Omega\otimes\Delta\phi).
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.55}
$$

For brevity, we write out:

$$
\sum_{u\in U^{\alpha,\delta<j}_{\Delta\phi}} a_u C^u_g(\phi,\Omega^\alpha)=\sum_{q\in Q}a_q C^q_g(\Omega^\alpha)\Delta\phi,
\tag{3.56}
$$

where each $C^q_g(\Omega^\alpha)\Delta\phi$ is in the form (3.55) with length σ and $\delta_R+\delta_\Omega+\alpha<j$. We denote by $C^{q,i_1\dots i_a}_g(\Omega^\alpha)$ the tensor field that arises from each $C^q_g(\Omega^\alpha)$ by making all the internal contractions into free indices.

Applying the "main conclusion" of the super divergence formula (see [3]) to $\int_M Y_g(\phi)dV_g=0$, and picking out the sublinear combination of length $\sigma+1$ witha factor $\nabla\phi$, we obtain a local equation in the form:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{q\in Q}a_q Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_a}\nabla^i[C^{q,i_1\dots i_a}_g(\Omega^\alpha)]\nabla_i\phi\\
&+\sum_{h\in H}a_h Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_b}C^{h,i_1\dots i_b}_g(\Omega^\alpha,\phi)=0,
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.57}
$$

modulo complete contractions of length $\geq\sigma+2$.[66] All the tensor fields above are acceptable without internal contractions. Moreover, each $b\geq j-1$ (and $b>j-1$ if we are additionnaly have $U^\alpha_{\nabla\phi,j-1=\emptyset}$) while each $a\leq j-1$.

We pick out the minimum rank a appearing above (we have denoted it by δ_{min}, where $\delta_{min}<j-1$, or $\delta_{min}=j-1$ under the additionnal assumption that $U^\alpha_{\nabla\phi,j-1}=\emptyset$.) and denote by $Q^{\delta_{min}}\subset Q$ the corresponding index set. We will show that there is a linear combination of acceptable $(\delta_{min}+1)$-tensor fields, $\sum_{h\in H}a_h C^{h,i_1\dots i_{\delta_{min}+1}}_g(\Omega^\alpha)$ so that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{q\in Q^{\delta_{min}}}a_q C^{q,i_1\dots i_a}_g(\Omega^\alpha)\nabla_{i_1}\upsilon\dots\nabla_{i_{\delta_{min}}}\upsilon\\
&-\sum_{h\in H}a_h Xdiv_{i_{min+1}}C^{h,i_1\dots i_{\delta_{min}+1}}_g(\Omega^\alpha)\nabla_{i_1}\upsilon\dots\nabla_{i_{\delta_{min}}}\upsilon=0,
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.58}
$$

modulo complete contractions of length $\geq\sigma+1$. Let us assume we have proven this; we will then show how to derive (3.34).

Proof that (3.58) implies (3.34): We define an operation Op that replaces each factor $\nabla^{(p+2)}\Omega$ by a factor $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$ and replaces each factor $\nabla\upsilon$ by an internal contraction and finally multiplies the contraction we obtain by $\Delta\phi$ (notice that the operation Op is almost exactly the same as the operation $Riccify$, defined in the appendix of [3]). Applying Op to (3.58) and using the fact that (3.58) holds formally, we derive (3.34) (the proof of this fact is precisely the same as the operation "Riccify" in subsection 5.1 in [3]).

---

[66] Recall that $Xdiv_i[\dots]$ in this context stands for the sublinear combination in $div_i[\dots]$ where the derivative ∇^i is not allowed to hit $\nabla\phi$, *nor* the factor to which the free index $_i$ belongs.

Proof of (3.58): Now, in order to derive (3.58) from (3.57), we will distinguish two subcases: Either $\alpha = \sigma$ or $\alpha < \sigma$.

We start with the second case. We pick out the sublinear combination in $\sum_{h\in H}\dots$ in (3.57) where the factor $\nabla\phi$ is contracting against a factor $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$ (the condition $\alpha < \sigma$ guarantees that there is such a factor). We denote by $H_* \subset H$ the index set of that sublinear combination. We also denote by

$$\nabla^i_*[C^{q,i_1\dots i_a}_g(\Omega^\alpha)]\nabla_i\phi$$

the sublinear combination in

$$\nabla^i[C^{q,i_1\dots i_a}_g(\Omega^\alpha)]\nabla_i\phi$$

where ∇^i is only allowed to hit factors $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$.

Since (3.57) holds formally, we derive that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{q\in Q} a_q Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_a}\nabla^i_*[C^{q,i_1\dots i_a}_g(\Omega^\alpha)]\nabla_i\phi\\&+\sum_{h\in H_*} a_h Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_b}C^{h,i_1\dots i_b}_g(\Omega^\alpha,\phi)=0.\end{aligned}\tag{3.59}$$

We then denote by $H^\sharp_* \subset H_*$ the index set of those tensor fields for which the factor $\nabla\phi$ is contracting against an internal index of the factor $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$. By applying the second claim in Lemma 3.1 we deduce as before that we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{h\in H^\sharp_*} a_h Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_b}C^{h,i_1\dots i_b}_g(\Omega^\alpha,\phi)\\&=\sum_{h\in H_{**}} a_h Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_b}C^{h,i_1\dots i_b}_g(\Omega^\alpha,\phi),\end{aligned}\tag{3.60}$$

where each tensor field on the right hand side has $b > j-1$ ($b > j$ under the additonnal auumption that $U^\alpha_{\nabla\phi,j-1} = \emptyset$) and the factor $\nabla\phi$ is contracting against the derivative index of some factor $\nabla^{(m)}R_{ijkl}$. Substituting the above in (3.59) and applying Proposition 3.1 along with the operation $Erase_{\nabla\phi}$, we derive (3.58).

Now, the case $\alpha = \sigma$: We recall equation (3.57) where we polarize the function Ω into $\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_\sigma$, obtaining a new true equation. We denote the corresponding tensor fields by $C^{q,i_1\dots i_a}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_\sigma,\phi)$, $C^{h,i_1\dots i_b}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_\sigma,\phi)$.

We denote by $H_* \subset H$ the index set of those tensor fields for which $\nabla\phi$ is contracting against the factor $\nabla^{(a)}\Omega_1$. We also denote by ∇^i_* the sublinear combination in ∇^i where ∇^i is only allowed to hit the factor $\nabla^{(a)}\Omega_1$.

Thus, we derive that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{q\in Q} a_q Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_a}\nabla^i_*[C^{q,i_1\dots i_a}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_\sigma)]\nabla_i\phi+\\&\sum_{h\in H_*} a_h Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_b}C^{h,i_1\dots i_b}_g(\Omega_1,\dots,\Omega_\sigma,\phi)=0.\end{aligned}\tag{3.61}$$

We denote by $H^\sharp_* \subset H_*$ the index set of those tensor fields for which the factor $\nabla\phi$ is contracting against a factor $\nabla^{(2)}\Omega_1$ (with exactly two derivatives). Then, by applying Lemma 4.6 in [6],[67] we can derive:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{h\in H^\sharp_*} a_h Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_b}C^{h,i_1\dots i_b}_g(\Omega^\sigma,\phi)\\&=\sum_{h\in H_{**}} a_h Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_b}C^{h,i_1\dots i_b}_g(\Omega^\sigma,\phi),\end{aligned}\tag{3.62}$$

where each tensor field on the right hand side has $b > j-1$ and the factor $\nabla\phi$ is contracting against a factor $\nabla^{(A)}\Omega$ with $A \geq 3$.[68] Substituting the above in (3.59) and applying the operation $Erase_{\nabla\phi}$ from the Appendix in [3], we notice that all resulting complete contractions are acceptable (in particular they have each factor $\nabla^{(a_s)}\Omega_s$ having $a_s \geq 2$); thus we derive our claim (3.34).

Proof of (3.35) under the simplifying assumption:

The proof of this claim will be slightly more involved in the case where $\delta_{min} = j-1$. We first prove (3.35) in the case $\delta_{min} > j-1$:

The case $\delta_{min} > j-1$: For each $u \in U^\alpha_{\Delta\phi}$, we denote by $C^{u,i_1}_g(\phi)$ the complete contraction that arises from $C^u_g(\phi)$ by replacing $\Delta\phi$ by $\nabla_{i_1}\phi$. We observe that we can write:

$$\sum_{u\in U^\alpha_{\Delta\phi}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) - div_{i_1}C^{u,i_1}_g(\phi) = \sum_{u\in U'^\alpha_{\nabla\phi}} C^u_g(\phi)$$

where the linear combination on the RHS stands for a generic linear combination of complete contractions with a factor $\nabla\phi$, α factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$ and $\delta > j-1$.

---

[67] As noted in [6], that Lemma is a *consequence* of the "fundamental Proposition". There is no logical dependence of that Lemma on any of the work in this paper or in [3, 5].

[68] We only need to check that the hypotheses of this Lemma are satisfied in the case where the minimum rank b_{min} appearing among the tensor fields in $H^\sharp_*$ is $b_{min} = 1$, and in addition there are tensor fields indexed in $H^\sharp_*$ with rank 1 and the one free index $_{i_1}$ belonging to an expression $\nabla^{(2)}_{ii_1}\Omega_1\nabla^i\phi$. In that case we see that the extra assumption needed for Lemma 4.6 is fulfilled by virtue of a weight restriction–this follows since $j \geq 2$ and all internal contractions in $P(g)|_{L^j_\sigma}$ involve only derivative indices.

In view of this equation, it suffices to show (3.35) under the additional assumption that $U^\alpha_{\Delta\phi}=\emptyset$.

Now, to show (3.35) under this extra assumption we consider the equation $\int_M Y_g(\phi)dV_g=0$ (in the assumption of Lemma 3.2). We apply the "main conclusion" of the super divergence formula (see [3]) and we pick out the sublinear combination of terms with length $\sigma+1$ and a factor $\nabla\phi$, thus deriving a new local equation:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{u\in U^\alpha_{\nabla\phi,\delta_{min}}} a_u Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_{\delta_{min}}} C^{u,i_1\dots i_{\delta_{min}}}_g(\phi,\Omega^\alpha)+\\ &\sum_{u\in U^\alpha_{\nabla\phi,\delta>\delta_{min}}} a_u Xdiv_{i_1}\dots Xdiv_{i_\delta} C^{u,i_1\dots i_a}_g(\phi,\Omega^\alpha)=0.\end{aligned} \tag{3.63}$$

Then (3.35) follows by applying Corollary 1 to (3.63);[69] we derive that there is a linear combination of $(\beta+1)$-vector fields (indexed in $U^\alpha_{\nabla\phi,\delta=\delta_{min}+1}$ below) so that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{u\in U^\alpha_{\nabla\phi,\delta_{min}}} a_u C^{u,i_1\dots i_{\delta_{min}}}_g(\phi,\Omega^\alpha)\nabla_{i_1}\dots\nabla_{i_{\delta_{min}}}\upsilon+\\ &\sum_{u\in U^\alpha_{\nabla\phi,\delta_{min}+1}} a_u Xdiv_{i_{\delta_{min}+1}} C^{u,i_1\dots i_{\delta_{min}+1}}_g(\phi,\Omega^\alpha)\nabla_{i_1}\upsilon\dots\nabla_{i_{\delta_{min}}}\upsilon=0.\end{aligned} \tag{3.64}$$

By applying the operation $Riccify$ to the above (see subsection 5.1 in [3]) we derive our claim, in the case $\delta_{min}>j-1$.

Now, the case $\delta_{min}=j-1$: We introduce some notational conventions. We break up the linear combination $\sum_{u\in U^\alpha_{\Delta\phi,j-1}}\dots$ into two pieces (by dividing the index set $U^\alpha_{\Delta\phi,j-1}$ into two subsets): We will say that $u\in U^{\alpha|I}_{\Delta\phi,j-1}$ if the complete contraction $C^u_g(\phi)$ has the property that all α factors $\nabla^{(p)}Ric$ have at least one internal contraction;[70] we define $U^{\alpha|II}_{\Delta\phi,j-1}=U^\alpha_{\Delta\phi,j-1}\setminus U^{\alpha|I}_{\Delta\phi,j-1}$.

By applying the second Bianchi identity we derive that we can write:

$$\sum_{u\in U^{\alpha|I}_{\Delta\phi,j-1}} a_u C^u_g(\phi)=\sum_{u\in\tilde{U}^{\alpha|I}_{\Delta\phi,j-1}} a_u C^u_g(\phi)+\sum_{u\in U^{\alpha-1}_{\Delta\phi}} a_u C^u_g(\phi), \tag{3.65}$$

where the complete contractions indexed in $\tilde{U}^{\alpha|I}_{\Delta\phi,j-1}$ have all the generic properties of the complete contractions indexed in $U^{\alpha|I}_{\Delta\phi,j-1}$ *and* have the feature that the two indices ${}_a, {}_b$ in every factor $\nabla^{(p)} Ric_{ab}$ contract against each other;[71] the linear combination $\sum_{u\in U^{\alpha-1}_{\Delta\phi}} a_u C^u_g(\phi)$ stands for a generic linear combination as allowed in the RHS of (3.35).

---

[69] Since $\delta_{min}>j-1\geq 1$ we do not have to worry about the extra restrictions in that corollary when $\alpha=1$.

[70] Not counting the one in $Ric_{ab}=R^i{}_{aib}$ itself.

In view of the above, we may assume with no loss of generality that all the α factors $\nabla^{(p)} Ric_{ab}$ in every $C^u_g(\phi), u \in U^{\alpha|I}_{\Delta\phi,j-1}$ have the indices ${}_a, {}_b$ contracting against each other. Now, for each $u \in U^{\alpha|I}_{\Delta\phi,j-1}$, we denote by $C^{u,i_1}_g(\phi)$ the vector field that arises from $C^u_g(\phi)$ by replacing $\Delta\phi$ by $\nabla_{i_1}\phi$. We observe that we can write:

$$\sum_{u\in U^{\alpha|I}_{\Delta\phi,j-1}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) - div_{i_1} C^{u,i_1}_g(\phi) = \sum_{u\in U'^{\alpha}_{\nabla\phi}} a_u C^u_g(\phi), \tag{3.66}$$

where the linear combination on the RHS stands for a generic linear combination of complete contractions with a factor $\nabla\phi$, α factors $\nabla^{(p)} Ric$ and $\delta = j-1$ *and* with the feature that all the α factors $\nabla^{(p)} Ric_{ab}$ have the indices ${}_a, {}_b$ contracting against each other. Thus, by virtue of (3.65), (3.66) we may assume with no loss of generality that $U^{\alpha|I}_{\Delta\phi,j-1} = \emptyset$.

Now, we again consider the "main conclusion" of the super divergence formula applied to the integral equation $\int_{M^n} Y_g(\phi) dV_g = 0$ (see the statement of Lemma 3.2) and we pick out the sublinear combination of terms with length $\sigma + 1$ and a factor $\nabla\phi$, thus deriving a new local equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{u\in U^{\alpha}_{\nabla\phi,j-1}} a_u X div_{i_1} \dots X div_{i_{j-1}} C^{u,i_1\dots i_\beta}_g(\phi,\Omega^\alpha) \\
&+ \sum_{u\in U'} a_u X div_{i_1} \dots X div_{i_{j-1}} C^{u,i_1\dots i_\beta}_g(\phi,\Omega^\alpha) \\
&+ \sum_{u\in U^{\alpha}_{\nabla\phi,\delta>j-1}} a_u X div_{i_1} \dots X div_{i_\delta} C^{u,i_1\dots i_\delta}_g(\phi,\Omega^\alpha) = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.67}$$

where the tensor fields indexed in U' have rank $j-1$ but at least one of the α factors $\nabla^{(B)}\Omega$ does not contain a free index.[72] The terms in $U^{\alpha}_{\nabla\phi,\delta>j-1}$ have rank $> j-1$.

Now, we apply Corollary 1 to (3.67) and pick out the sublinear combination of terms where all factors $\nabla^{(p)}\Omega$ contract against at least one factor $\nabla\upsilon$; this sublinear combination must vanish separately, thus we derive a new equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{u\in U^{\alpha}_{\nabla\phi,j-1}} a_u C^{u,i_1\dots i_\beta}_g(\phi,\Omega^\alpha) \nabla_{i_1}\upsilon \dots \nabla_{i_{j-1}}\upsilon \\
&- \sum_{h\in H} a_h X div_{i_j} C^{u,i_1\dots i_j}_g(\phi,\Omega^\alpha) \nabla_{i_1}\upsilon \dots \nabla_{i_{j-1}}\upsilon = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.68}$$

---

[71] In other words that factor is of the form $\nabla^{(p)} R$, where R stands for the scalar curvature

[72] These terms arise from the sublinear combination $\sum_{u\in U^{\alpha|I}_{\Delta\phi,j-1}} a_u C^u_g(\phi)$.

where the tensor fields indexed in H have each factor $\nabla^{(p)}\Omega$ contracting against at least one factor $\nabla\upsilon$. Now, recall that for each of the terms indexed in $U^{\alpha}_{\nabla\phi,j-1}$ in the above, the last index ${}_{r_p}$ in each factor $\nabla^{(p)}_{r_1\dots r_p}\Omega$ is contracting against a factor $\nabla\upsilon$. By just permuting indices we may assume that the same is true for each of the terms indexed in H. Then, *since (3.68) holds formally* we may assume that this last index in each of the factors $\nabla^{(p)}\Omega$ is *not* permuted in the formal permutations of indices by which (3.68) is made *formally* true. Then, applying the operation $Riccify$ to the above we derive that there is a vector field $\sum_{h\in H'} a_h C^{h,i}_g(\phi)$ so that:

$$\sum_{u\in U^{\alpha}_{\nabla\phi,j-1}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) - \sum_{h\in H'} a_h C^{u,i_1}_g(\phi) = \sum_{u\in U^{\alpha}_{\nabla\phi,\delta>j-1}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) + \sum_{x\in X} a_x C^x_g(\phi), \tag{3.69}$$

(in the notational conventions of (3.35)). Thus we are reduced to showing our claim in the case where $U^{\alpha}_{\nabla\phi,j-1} = U^{\alpha|I}_{\nabla\phi,j-1} = \emptyset$. Our claim then follows by appealing to (3.34), where we now have the additionnal assumption that $U^{\alpha}_{\nabla\phi,j-1} = \emptyset$. □

Proof of (3.34), (3.35) without the simplifying assumption:

Now, we explain how to prove (3.34), (3.35) in the case where there are factors R among the contractions indexed in $U^{\alpha}_{\nabla\phi}\bigcup U^{\alpha}_{\Delta\phi}$ (i.e. *without* the simplifying assumption). Let $M\epsilon\gamma$ be the maximum number of factors R among the complete contractions indexed in $U^{\alpha}_{\nabla\phi}\bigcup U^{\alpha}_{\Delta\phi}$.

We then reduce ourselves to the case where there are no such factors by a downward induction on $M\epsilon\gamma$. If $M\epsilon\gamma \le \sigma-3$ then we can prove (3.34), (3.35) by just repeating the proof under the simplifying assumption, as in the proof of Lemmas 5.4, 5.5 when $M\le\sigma-3$ in [3]: We prove the claims for the sublinear combinations in the LHS which have $M\epsilon\gamma$ factors R, allowing terms in the RHSs with $M\epsilon\gamma-1$ factors R. The argument runs unobstructed when $M\epsilon\gamma\ge 3$, since (as in [3]) whenever we wish to invoke Corollary 1 or the first technical Proposition from [6], the equations to which we apply them have $\sigma\ge 3$.

The case $M\epsilon\gamma\le 2$: We reduce ourselves to the case $M\epsilon\gamma\ge 3$ by an *explicit* construction of divergences, followed by an application of the "main conclusion" of the super divergence formula:

In the setting of equations (3.34), (3.35) we denote by $U_{\Delta\phi,*}, U_{\nabla\phi,*}$ the index sets of complete contractions $C^u(g)\Delta\phi, C^u_g(\phi)$ with at least $\sigma-2$ factors R (hence for those complete contractions α can be $\sigma,\sigma-1$ or $\sigma-2$). We claim that there exist a vector fields as required in (3.34), (3.35), indexed in H, H' below, so that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{u\in U_{\Delta\phi,*}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) - div_i \sum_{h\in H} a_h C^{h,i}_g(\Delta\phi) = (Const)_* C^*(g)\Delta\phi + \\ &\sum_{u\in U_{\Delta\phi,-}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) + \sum_{x\in X} a_x C^x_g(\phi),\end{aligned} \tag{3.70}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{u\in U_{\nabla\phi,*}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) - div_i \sum_{h\in H'} a_h C^{h,i}_g(\phi) = (Const)_\sharp C^\sharp_g(\phi) \\ &+ \sum_{u\in U_{\nabla\phi,\delta>j-1,-}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) + \sum_{x\in X} a_x C^x_g(\phi);\end{aligned} \tag{3.71}$$

Here the complete contractions $C^*, C^\sharp$ are *explicit* complete contractions in forms and respectively (their form depends on the value fo α). Moreover the complete contractions indexed in $U_{\Delta\phi,-}, U_{\nabla\phi,\delta>j-1,-}$ have at least j internal contractions and also strictly fewer than $\sigma-2$ factors R, and a factor $\Delta\phi, \nabla\phi$ respectively.

Finally, we claim that there exists a vector field indexed in H'' below as required in (3.35) so that:

$$\begin{aligned}&-(Const)_*\nabla^i[C^*(g)]\nabla_i\phi + (Const)_\sharp C^u_g(\phi) - div_i \sum_{h\in H''} a_h C^{h,i}_g(\phi) = \\ &\sum_{u\in U_{\nabla\phi,\delta>j-1,-}} a_u C^u_g(\phi) + \sum_{x\in X} a_x C^x_g(\phi),\end{aligned} \tag{3.72}$$

with the same conventions as above in the RHS.

Clearly, if we can show these three Lemmas we will have then reduced ourselves to showing Lemma 3.2 under the additional assumption that each contraction with a factor $\nabla\phi$ or $\Delta\phi$ can have at most $\sigma-3$ factors R; this case has already been settled.

Mini-Proof of (3.70), (3.71): The divergences needed for these equations are constructed *explicitly*. The (simple) technique we use is explained in great detail in section 3 of [5]. Consider the two factors T_1, T_2 which are *not* in the form R (of the scalar curvature). Consider any particular contractions between these two factors. If one of the indices is a derivative index, we explicitly subtract the divergence corresponding to that index. The correction terms we get are either allowed in the RHSs of our equations, or have increased the number of internal contractions.[73] One can see that we can perform this explicit construction repeatedly to obtain the terms $C^*, C^\sharp$ in the RHSs.

Mini-Proof of (3.72): We perform the same explcicit construction as described above for the term $-(Const)_*\nabla^i[C^*(g)]\nabla_i\phi$, to derive (3.72) with an additional term $[-2(Const)_* + (Const)_\sharp]C^u_g(\phi)$ in the RHS. Then, substituting this into the integral equation $\int_{M^n} Y_g(\phi)dV_g = 0$ (see the assumption of Lemma 3.2) and applying the main conclusion of the super divergence formula, we derive that $-2(Const)_* + (Const)_\sharp = 0$. □

---

[73] We also apply the second Bianchi identity whenever necessary to create particular contractions as described above, whenever possible.

References

[1] S. Alexakis *On the decomposition of Global Conformal Invariants I,* Ann. of Math.**170** (2009), no. 3, 1241–1306.

[2] S. Alexakis *On the decomposition of Global Conformal Invariants II*, Adv. in Math. **206** (2006), 466-502.

[3] S. Alexakis *The decomposition of Global Conformal Invariants: A Conjecture of Deser an Schwimmer I*, arXiv.

[4] S. Alexakis *The decomposition of Global Conformal Invariants: A Conjecture of Deser an Schwimmer II*, arXiv.

[5] S. Alexakis *The decomposition of Global Conformal Invariants: A Conjecture of Deser an Schwimmer III*, arXiv.

[6] S. Alexakis *The decomposition of Global Conformal Invariants: A Conjecture of Deser an Schwimmer IV*, arXiv.

[7] S. Alexakis *The decomposition of Global Conformal Invariants: A Conjecture of Deser an Schwimmer V*, arXiv.

[8] S. Alexakis *The decomposition of Global Conformal Invariants: A Conjecture of Deser an Schwimmer VI*, arXiv.

[9] M. Atiyah, R. Bott, V. K. Patodi, *On the heat equation and the index theorem* Invent. Math. **19** (1973), 279–330.

[10] T. N. Bailey, M. G. Eastwood, A. R. Gover *Thomas's structure bundle for conformal, projective and related structures* Rocky Mountain J. Math. **24** (1994), no. 4, 1191–1217.

[11] T. N. Bailey, M. G. Eastwood, C. R. Graham *Invariant Theory for Conformal and CR Geometry* Ann. of Math. (2), **139** (1994), 491-552.

[12] A. Ĉap, A. R. Gover *Tractor calculi for parabolic geometries* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **354** (2002), no. 4, 1511–1548.

[13] A. Ĉap, A. R. Gover *Standard tractors and the conformal ambient metric construction* Ann. Global Anal. Geom. **24** (2003), no. 3, 231–259.

[14] É. Cartan *Sur la réduction à sa forme canonique de la structure d'un groupe de transformations fini et continu*, Oeuvres Complètes **1**, Part 1, 293-355, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1952.

[15] S. Deser, A. Schwimmer *Geometric classification of conformal anomalies in arbitrary dimensions*, Phys. Lett. B309 (1993) 279-284.

[16] C. Fefferman *Monge-Ampère equations, the Bergman kernel and geometry of pseudo-convex domains*, Ann. of Math. **103** (1976), 395-416; Erratum **104** (1976), 393-394.

[17] C. Fefferman, C. R. Graham *Conformal Invariants* Élie Cartan et les mathematiques d'aujourd'hui, Astérisque numero hors serie, 1985, 95-116.

[18] C. Fefferman, C. R. Graham *The ambient metric*, arXiv:0710.0919.

[19] C. R. Graham, K. Hirachi *Inhomogeneous ambient metrics*, Symmetries and overdetermined systems of partial differential equations, 403–420, IMA Vol. Math. Appl., **144**, Springer, New York, 2008.

[20] K. Hirachi *Construction of Boundary Invariants and the Logarithmic Singularity of the Bergman Kernel* Ann. of Math. (2) **151** (2000), no. 2 151-191.

[21] K. Hirachi *Logarithmic singularity of the Szegö kernel and a global invariant of strictly pseudoconvex domains* Ann. of Math. (2) **163** (2006), no. 2, 499–515.

[22] T. Y. Thomas *The differential invariants of generalized spaces,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1934.

[23] H. Weyl *The classical groups*, Princeton University press.